



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 45]
No. 45]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, नवम्बर 8, 1986/कार्तिक 17, 1908
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1986/KARTIKA 17, 1908

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Page is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than
the Ministry of Defence)

विधि और न्याय मंत्रालय

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 अक्टूबर, 1986

सूचना

का. भा. 3779:—नोटरीय नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनु-
सरण में संसद प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री प्रताप
सिंह भारद्वाज, एडवोकेट, ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम
4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पश्चिमी
दिल्ली व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार
का आपत्ति इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिनों के भीतर लिखित
रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5 (7)]

प्रार. एन. पोद्दार, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
(Department of Legal Affairs)

New Delhi, the 27th October, 1986

NOTICE

S.O. 3779.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Au-
thority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956,
that application has been made to the said Authority, under
rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Pratap Singh Bhardwaj, Ad-
vocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in West
Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person
as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned
within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(73)/86-Judl.]

R. N. PODDAR, Competent Authority.

कामिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कामिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3780:—केंद्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन
अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों
का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित अपराधों को, उन अपराधों के रूप में
निर्दिष्ट करती है, जिनका अन्वेषण दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन द्वारा
किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

- (1) भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धारा
352, 355 और 401 के अधीन दण्डनीय अपराध;
- (2) ऊपर खण्ड (1) में उल्लिखित अपराधों में से एक या
अधिक से संबंध में या उससे संगत प्रयत्न, वृत्तप्रेषण और
पड़क्यन और वैसे ही संव्यवहार के प्रत्यक्ष में, उन्हीं तथ्यों
से उत्पन्न होने वाला कोई अन्य अपराध।

[संख्या 228/21/86-ए. बी. जी. (II)]

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel & Training)

New Delhi, the 24th October, 1986

S.O. 3780.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946) the Central Government hereby specifies the following offences as the offences which are to be investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment, namely :—

(1) Offences punishable under Sections 352, 355 and 401 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860);

(2) attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with, one or more of the offences mentioned in clause (1) above and any other offence committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/21/86-AVD.II]

आदेश

का. प्रा. 3781.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कर्नाटक राज्य की सहमति से भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धारा 352, 353, 354, 355 और 401 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों के और उक्त अपराधों के संबंध में या उससे संबंधित प्रयत्नों, षड्यंत्रों और षड्यंत्रों के साथ कर्नाटक राज्य में सं. 6, शंकरपुरम बंगलूर 4 में स्थित एक पंजीकृत संगम शंकरपुरा क्षेमभाषि धीसंग और बंगलूर के ग्रामों के विरुद्ध धारा. सी. 30/86 के संबंध में उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत वैसे ही संयवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किन्हीं ग्राम अपराधों के सम्बन्ध के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण, संपूर्ण कर्नाटक राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/21/86-ए. पी. डी. (II)]

जी. सीतारामन, प्रवर सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 3781.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the Government of the State of Karnataka hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Karnataka for investigation of offences punishable under sections 352, 353, 354, 355 and 401 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860), and attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction, arising out of the same facts in regard to R.C. 30/86-Bangalore against Shankarapura Kshembabhini Dhisangha, a Registered Association, situated at No. 6, Shankarapuram, Bangalore-4 and others of Bangalore in the State of Karnataka.

[No. 228/21/86-AVD-II]

G. SITARAMAN, Under Secy.

विस्तार मंत्रालय

(राजस्थान विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 38, अक्टूबर, 1986

आदेश

का. प्रा. 3782.—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिने विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया

है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश का. सं. 673/117/86-सी. शु.-VIII, तारीख 23-7-86 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि श्री एन. एम. मोहम्मद रफीक पुत्र श्री मोहम्मद मोहीदीन, III मंजिल, 244 गोविंदप्पा, नायकन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1 को निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और केन्द्रीय कारागार, मद्रास में अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ताकि उसे किसी भी प्रकार ऐसा कार्य करने से रोका जा सके जो विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन में हानिकारक हो।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिससे उक्त आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सके;

3. अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के 7 दिनों के भीतर पुलिस प्रायुक्त, मद्रास के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[का. सं. 673/117/86-सी. शु.-VIII]

Ministry of Finance

(Deptt. of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 28th October, 1986

ORDER

S.O. 3782.—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/117/86-Cus. VIII dated 23-7-86 under the said sub-section directing that Shri M. M. Mohamed Rafeek S/o Sri Mohamed Mohideen, IIIrd Floor, 244, Govindappa Naicken Street Madras-1 be detained and kept in custody in Central Prison, Madras with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange.

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of power conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Madras within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/117/86-Cus. VIII]

आदेश

का. प्रा. 3783.—भारत सरकार के संयुक्त सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश का. सं. 673/122/86-सी. शु.-VIII, तारीख 20-9-86 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि श्री मनोहर लाल पंजवानी, पुत्र श्री ठाकुर दास पंजवानी, 21 मुसंड कालोमी बम्बई-82 को निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और केन्द्रीय कारागार, बम्बई में अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ताकि उसे किसी भी प्रकार ऐसा काम करने से रोका जा सके जो विदेशी मुद्रा के संवर्धन में हानिकारक हो।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिससे उक्त आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सके;

3. अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के 7 दिनों के भीतर पुलिस प्रायुक्त, बम्बई के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[का. सं. 673/122/86-सी. शु.-VIII]

सुरेश चौधरी, उप सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 3783.—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/122/86-Cus. VIII dated 20-8-86 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Manohar Lal Panjwani S/o Shri Thakur Das Panjwani 2/1, Muland Colony, Bombay-82 be detained and kept in custody in the Central Prison, Bombay with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to the augmentation of foreign exchange.

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of power conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Bombay within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/122/86-Cus. VIII]
S. K. CHOWDHRY, Under Secy.

(प्राधिकार कार्य विभाग)
(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3784 :—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा 2 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एम. के. दुबे को जिनकी धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के तहत राजगढ़ सिहोर क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्ति की तीन वर्ष की पहली अवधि 31-3-1986 को समाप्त हो गयी है 1-4-1986 से प्रारम्भ होकर 13-7-1986 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए उक्त बैंक का पुनः अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या एक. 2-22/86-प्रार. प्रार. बी.]

(Department of Economic Affairs)
(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 9th October, 1986

S.O. 3784.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby reappoints Shri M. K. Dubey whose earlier tenure of three years appointment under sub-section (1) of section 11 had expired on 31-3-1986 as the Chairman of Rajgarh School Kshetriya Gramin Bank for a further period commencing from 1-4-1986 and ending with 13-7-1986.

[No. F. 2-22/86-RRB]

का. भा. 3785 :—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री भागर सुदर्शन नायक को राजगढ़ सिहोर क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक ब्यावसाय (म. प्र.) का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 14-7-86 से प्रारम्भ होकर 31-7-1988 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री भागर सुदर्शन नायक अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं. एक. 2-22/86-प्रार. प्रार. बी.]

S.O. 3785.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Nayar Sudershan Nayak as the Chairman of the Rajgarh Sehore Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Bhaora (M.P.) and specifies the period commencing on the 14-7-1986 and ending with the 31-7-1988 as the period for which the said Shri Nayar Sudershan Nayak shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-22/86-RRB]

का. भा. 3786 :—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा 2 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री प्रार. के. शुक्ल को जिनकी धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) के तहत भोजपुर रोहतास ग्रामीण बैंक, प्रार. (बिहार) के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्ति की तीन वर्ष की पहली अवधि 28-2-1986 को समाप्त हो गई है, 1-3-1986 से प्रारम्भ होकर 16-5-1986 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिये उक्त बैंक का पुनः अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. एक. 2-11/86-प्रार. प्रार. बी.]

च. बा. मीरचन्दानी, निदेशक

S.O. 3786.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) the Central Government hereby reappoints Shri R. K. Shukla whose earlier tenure of three years appointment under sub-section (1) of section 11 had expired on 28-2-1986 as the Chairman of Bhojpur Rohtas Gramin Bank, Arrah (Bihar) for a further period commencing from 1-3-1986 and ending with 16-5-1986.

[No. F.2-11/86-RRB]
C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Director

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3787 :—राष्ट्रपति संविधान के अनुच्छेद 77 के खंड (3) के अनुसरण में, वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन (वित्तीय संशोधन) नियम, 1986 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 की अनुसूची 3 में, उपाबंध में, क्रमसंख्या 3 के सामने स्तंभ 4 में,—

(क) पैरा 1 (क) में, “वस्तुतः बिगू सवारी भाड़े” शब्दों से प्रारम्भ होने वाले और “निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन की जा सकेंगी” शब्दों पर समाप्त होने वाले भाग के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा अर्थात् :—

“वस्तुतः बिगू सवारी भाड़े की प्रतिपूर्ति उस राजस्व-वित्त सरकारी सेवक को जो उस शहर की, जिसमें उसका मुख्यालय स्थित है, नगरपालिका सीमाओं के भीतर किसी सवारी में लोकाहित में तब यात्रा करता है जब स्टाफ कार उपलब्ध नहीं है, और कोई यात्रा भत्ता अनुशेष नहीं है, निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन की जा सकेंगी”;

(ख) पैरा 1 (ख) में, पहले उप-पैरा के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-पैरा रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“किसी अराजस्वित्त सरकारी सेवक को सवारी भाड़े की प्रतिपूर्ति की जा सकेगी जिसे (1) अपने कार्यालय से उस शहर की नगरपालिका सीमाओं के भीतर जिस में उसको कार्यालय स्थित है, कुछ दूरी पर किसी स्थान को कर्तव्य

पर भेजा जाता है यदि संबंधित सरकारी सेवक यात्रा के साधारण नियमों के अधीन यात्रा भत्ता लेने का हकदार नहीं है; अथवा (2) राजमंत्रित आकिसर के विशेष आदेश से कर्तव्य के सामान्य समय के अतिरिक्त कार्यालय बुलाया जाता है।"; और

(ग) "साधारण टिप्पण" शीर्ष के नीचे टिप्पण (8) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित टिप्पण रखा जाएगा, अर्थातः—

"(8) ऐसे आकिसर, जो, उस शहर को जिसमें उनका मुख्यालय स्थित है, नगरपालिका सीमाओं के भीतर लोकहित में यात्रा के लिए अपनी सवारी का प्रयोग करते हैं, संबंधित परिवहन, विदेशक द्वारा उस शहर में चल रही थावास्थिति, टैक्सी या ऑटो-रिक्शा के लिए, अधिसूचित दरों पर प्रतिपूर्ति का दावा कर सकते हैं।"

टिप्पण: वित्तीय शक्तियों का प्रत्यायोजन नियम, 1978 अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 2131 तारीख 22 जुलाई, 1978 द्वारा प्रकाशित किए गए थे और तत्पश्चात् निम्नलिखित द्वारा संशोधित किए गए :

- (1) अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 1887, तारीख 9-6-1979
- (2) अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 2942, तारीख 1-9-1979
- (3) अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 2611, तारीख 4-10-1980
- (4) अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 2164, तारीख 15-8-1981
- (5) अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 2303, तारीख 5-9-1981
- (6) अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 3073, तारीख 4-9-1982
- (7) " " 4171, तारीख 11-12-1982
- (8) " " 1314, तारीख 26-2-1983
- (9) " " 2502, तारीख 4-8-1984
- (10) " " 22, तारीख 5-1-1985
- (11) " " 1958, तारीख 11-5-1985
- (12) " " 3082, तारीख 6-7-1985
- (13) " " 3974, तारीख 24-8-1985
- (14) " " 5641, तारीख 21-12-1985
- (15) " " 1548, तारीख 19-4-1986
- (16) " " 3183, तारीख 20-9-86

[सं. एफ. 1(13)-ई-II (ए)/1863]

डी. त्यागेश्वरन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 7th October, 1986

S.O. 3787.—In pursuance of clause (3) of article 77 of the Constitution of India, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Delegation of Financial Powers (Third Amendment) Rules, 1986.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In Schedule V to the Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978, in the Annexure, against serial number 3, in column 4,—

(a) in paragraph 1(A), for the portion beginning with the words "The conveyance hire charges actually paid" and ending with the words "subject to the following conditions", the following shall be substituted, namely :—

"The conveyance hire charges actually paid may be reimbursed to a Gazetted Government servant, who performs a journey in the public interest, within the municipal limits of the city in which his headquarter is situated in a conveyance when staff car is not available and where no travelling allowance is admissible, subject to the following conditions";

(b) In paragraph 1(B), for first sub-paragraph, the following sub-paragraph shall be substituted, namely :—

"Conveyance hire charges may be reimbursed to a non-Gazetted Government servant who (i) is despatched on duty to a place at some distance from his office within the municipal limits of the city in which his office is situated, if the Government servant concerned is not entitled to draw travelling allowance under the ordinary rules for the journey; or (ii) is summoned to office outside the hours ordinary of duty by special order of a Gazetted Officer."; and

(c) under the heading "General Notes", for Note (viii), the following Note shall be substituted, namely :—

"(viii) Officers using their own conveyance for journeys in public interest within the municipal limits of the city in which their headquarters is situated may claim reimbursement at the rates notified, by the concerned Director of Transport, for taxi or, as the case may be, auto-rickshaw plying in that city."

Note : The Delegation of Financial Powers Rules, 1978 published vide Notification S.O. 2131, dated 22nd July, 1978 have subsequently been amended by :—

- (i) Notification No. S.O. 1887, dated 9-6-1979.
- (ii) " No. S.O. 2942, dated 1-9-1979.
- (iii) " No. S.O. 2611, dated 4-10-1980
- (iv) " No. S.O. 2164, dated 15-8-1981
- (v) " No. S.O. 2303, dated 5-9-1981
- (vi) " No. S.O. 3073, dated 4-9-1982
- (vii) " No. S.O. 4171, dated 11-12-1982
- (viii) " No. S.O. 1314, dated 26-2-1983
- (ix) " No. S.O. 2502, dated 4-8-1984
- (x) " No. S.O. 22, dated 5-1-1985
- (xi) Corrigendum No. S.O. 1958, dated 11-5-1985
- (xii) " Notification No. S.O. 3082, dated 6-7-1985
- (xiii) " " No. S.O. 3974, dated 24-9-1985
- (xiv) " " No. S.O. 5641, dated 21-12-1985
- (xv) " " No. S.O. 1548, dated 19-4-1986
- (xvi) " " No. S.O. 3183, dated 20-9-1986

[No. F. 1(13) E-II(A)/86]

D. THYAGESWARAN Under Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

(ग्रामीण आयोजना और ऋण विभाग)

बम्बई, 23 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3788 :—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 42 की उपधारा (7) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक इसके द्वारा क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम 1976 (1976 का 21) के अन्तर्गत गठित समस्त क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों 2 अक्टूबर, 1986 से शुरू कर एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए धारा 42 की उपधारा (1) के पष्ठनुक के उपबंधों से छूट प्रदान करता है।

[भार. पी. सी. डी. सं. भार. एक. 313 ए/324-86/87]

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

(Rural Planning and Credit Department)

Bombay, the 23rd October, 1986

S.O. 3788.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (7) of Section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Reserve Bank of India hereby exempts all Regional Rural Banks constituted under the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) from the provisions of the proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 42 for a further period of one year commencing from 2 October 1986.

[RPCD No. RF. 313A/324-86/87]

का. भा. 3789 :—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 42 की उपधारा (7) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक एतद्वारा क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम 1976 (1976 का 21) के अन्तर्गत गठित समस्त क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंकों को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम 1934 की धारा 42 की उपधारा (1 ए) के उपबंधों से दिनांक 12 नवम्बर, 1986 से एक और वर्ष के लिए मुक्त करता है।

[भार. पी. सी. डी. सं. भार. एक. 381 ए/324-86/87]

डा. पी. डी. जोषा, उप गवर्नर

S.O. 3789.—In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (7) of Section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Reserve Bank of India hereby exempts all Regional Rural Banks constituted under the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) from the provisions of sub-section (1A) of Section 42 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 for a further period of one year commencing from 12 November 1986.

[RPCD. No. RF. 381A/324/86/87]

DR. P. D. JOSHA, Dy. Governor

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात का कार्यालय)

(विविध लाइसेंसिंग अनुभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 अक्टूबर, 1986

का.भा. 3790:—होटल ओबरोय टावर्स, बम्बई को संलग्न सूची के अनुसार अतिरिक्त सामग्री पुर्ण सहित होटल प्रचालन उपस्कर आनुवंशिकों तथा सहायक उपकरणों का आयात करने के लिए 1,75,000/-रु० मूल्य के आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/पी 0493874/सी एक्स एस/01/एच/86/एम एल एस दिनांक 25-8-86, इसके जारी होने की तिथि से 18 महीने की अवधि के साथ दिया गया था।

अब पार्टी ने उक्त आयात लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि आयात लाइसेंस (बोनों प्रतियाँ) जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस खो गया है। लाइसेंस धारक ने एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया जिसके अनुसार उक्त आयात लाइसेंस को किसी भी सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में के पास पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया था तथा उसका बिल्कुल भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया था और लाइसेंस के मद्दे 1, 75, 000/- शेष हैं। शपथपत्र में यह भी घोषणा की गई है कि यदि उक्त आयात लाइसेंस बाब में मिल जाता है तो इसे जारी करने वाले प्राधिकारी को लौटा दिया जाएगा। यह संतुष्टि होने पर कि मूल आयात लाइसेंस खो गया है, अधोहस्ताक्षरी यह निवेश देता है कि आवेदक को एक अनुलिपि आयात लाइसेंस सीमाशुल्क तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजनों दोनों प्रतियाँ जारी की जानी चाहिए। आयात (नियंत्रण) आवेद, 1955 को धारा 9 की उप-धारा (घ) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अंश कारो का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, भी उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रतियों को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[फाईल सं. 18/99/86-87 एम. एल. एस./393]

एन. एस. कृष्णामूर्ती

उप मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात

क्षेत्रीय मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(M. L. SECTION)

New Delhi, the 23rd October, 1986

S.O. 3790.—Hotel Oberoi Towers, Bombay were granted an Import Licence No. P/P/0493874/C/X/01-H-86-MLS dated 25-8-86 for import of Hotel Operating Equipment with Standard Spares, accessories, attachments as per list attached valued at Rs. 1,75,000 with a validity of 18 months from the date of issue. Now the party have applied for grant of a Duplicate Import Licence (both copies) of the aforesaid Import Licence on the ground that the subject Licence has been lost. The licensee has furnished necessary affidavit according to which the aforesaid Import Licence was not registered with any Customs House and was not utilised at all and the balance against the licence is Rs. 1,75,000. A declaration has also been incorporated in the affidavit to the effect that if the said Import Licence is traced or found later on it will be returned to the issuing authority. On being satisfied that the original Import Licence has been lost, the undersigned directs that a Duplicate Import Licence (both Customs as well as Exchange Control Purposes Copies) should be issued to be applicant. I also in exercise of the powers conferred in Sub-Clause (d) of Clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order 1955, hereby cancel the original Customs as well as Exchange Control Purposes Copies of the above licence.

[F. No. 18/99/86-87/MLS/393]

N. S. KRISHNAMURTHI, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

For Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

लाघ और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3791:—नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग, जाय और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय में निदेशक कु. सी. सोहोनी ने बायबा बाजार प्रायोग के अग्रणीक सदस्य के रूप में अपनी अवधि समाप्त हो जाने पर 30 सितम्बर 1986 के अग्रणीक से उक्त प्रायोग में सदस्य के पद का कार्यभार छोड़ दिया है।

[मिनिम सं. ए-12011/17/82-प्रा. भा. II]

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Civil Supplies)

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1986

S.O. 3791.—On the completion of her term as part-time Member Forward Markets Commission, Bombay, Kum. C. Sohoni, Director in the Department of Civil Supplies, Ministry of Food and Civil Supplies, relinquished charge of the post of Member in the Commission on the afternoon of the 30th September, 1986 (A.N.).

[File No. A-12011/17/82-Estt.II]

का. अ. 3792.—अग्रिम संविदा (विनियम) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) के खण्ड-3 की धारा 2 और धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एस.के.पाले, आई.आर.एस. (सी.एच.से.ई. 1971) को 2000-2250 रुपये के

बेतनमान में 30 सितम्बर, 1986 (पूर्वाह्न) से अगले आदेश होने तक नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग के अग्रिम बायदा बाजार आयोग के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करता है।

[मिसिस सं. ए-12011/17/82—प्रका. II]

श्री. पी. खेतपाल, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3792.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section (2) and (4) of section 3 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. K. Pali, IRS (C&CE : 1971) as Member, Forward Markets Commission, Bombay, under the Department of Civil Supplies in the scale of pay of Rs. 2000-2250 w.e.f. 30th September, 1986 (FN) until further orders.

[F. No. A-12011/17/82 E.II]

O. P. KHETRAPAL, Under Secy.

(भारतीय मानक संस्था)

नई दिल्ली, 17 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. अ. 3793 :—समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) विनियम 1953 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन 100 लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे लाइसेंसधारियों को मानक सम्बन्धी मुहर लगाने का अधिकार देते हुए फरवरी 1984 में स्वीकृत किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची

कम लाइसेंस संख्या सी एम/एल संख्या	संख्या की अवधि		लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	IS : पदनाम	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1. सी एम/एल-1273848 1984-02-02	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	स्वदेशी इंटरप्राइजेज एण्ड केमिकल्स इंडिया, 111/108 ए, पोडरपुरवा, कानपुर-208007 (कार्यालय : 26/50, बिरहना रोड, कानपुर-208001)	IS : 562--1978	
2. सी एम/एल-1273949 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	विमको इंडस्ट्रीज, 13-एक, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, गोविन्दपुरा, भोपाल-462023, (म. प्र.)	IS : 2339--1963	
3. सी एम/एल-1274042 1984-01-25	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	प्रादेशिक को-ऑपरेटिव डेयरी, फडरेशन लिमिटेड, कटाले फीड प्लांट, ननगोल रोड, परतापुर, मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	IS : 2052--1979	
4. सी एम/एल-1274143 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	कनोरिया प्रकल्पित एण्ड प्लास्टिक लि., प्लाट संख्या 7, सिटे नं., 4, साहिबाबाद इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, गाजियाबाद (उ. प्र.)	IS : 561--1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
5. सी एम/एल-1274244 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	महामाया वायर प्रोडक्शंस, 15, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, जम्मू-180003	IS : 398(भाग 2) —1976	
6. सी एम/एल-1274345 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	कुलम रबड़ फब्रिकरी, वि कोजिकोडा जिला को-ऑपरेटिव रबड़ मार्केटिंग सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, कुप्पायाकोड पो. धा. कोजिकोड, जिला-673580 (केरला)	IS : 4588—1977	
7. सी एम/एल-1274446 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	नारदन मिनिस्ट्रस प्रा. लिमिटेड बोलताबाद रोड, गुड़गांव, (कार्यालय : 278-कटरा पेशान, तिलक बाजार, दिल्ली-110006)	IS : 8028—1976	
8. सी एम/एल-1274547 1948-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	ए पी टी (बिहारी) इंजीनियरिंग प्रा. लि. सी-38/1, प्रशोक बिहार इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, दिल्ली-110052	IS : 4246—1978	
9. सी एम/एल-1274648 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	सिल्वर फ्लोर, एफ्लायस 60/11, डी. एल. एफ. इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फरीदाबाद-121003, (हरियाणा)	IS : 4246—1978	
10. सी एम/एल-1274749 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	नारदन स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, जी. टी. रोड, लाल कुंभ्रा, हैवी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया नं. I, गाजियाबाद-201009	IS : 1729—1979	
11. सी एम/एल-1274850 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	वेनेस इंडस्ट्रीज, 5, नू बजोरपुर इंडस्ट्रियल कॉम्प्लेक्स, दिल्ली-110052	IS : 3854—1966	
12. सी एम/एल-1274951 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1984-02-15	बोधरो मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा. लि.), प्लॉट 71, सेक्टर 6, फरीदाबाद- फरीदाबाद-121006	IS : 5950—1971	
13. सी एम/एल-1275044 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	सोमेवत इंडिया, डब्ल्यू जेड-143, महावीर नगर, नई दिल्ली-110018	IS : 694—1977	
14. सी एम/एल-1275145 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	गिजडीत केबल (इंडिया), डो-57, सेक्टर 6, नौदेडा, जिला गाजियाबाद (उ. प्र.)	IS : 694—1977	
15. सी एम/एल-1275246 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	कुकरेता ट्रांसमार्निंग मैन्यु. कं., ए-8, बजोरपुर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-110052	IS : 9857—1981	
16. सी एम/एल-1275347 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	एस केबल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि., स्ट्रीट नं. 8 बजोरपुर, बाली, दिल्ली-110042	IS : 5950—1971	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
17. सी एम/एल-1275448 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन लि., (असम आयल डिबीजन) डिगबोई रिफाइनरी पो. आ. डिगबोई 78617 (असम)	IS : 4634--1974	
18. सी एम/एल-1275549 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	बिरला जूट एण्ड लिमिटेड, यूनिट : बिरला जूट मिल, पो. आ. बिरलापुर जिला 24-परगना (प. बं.) (कार्यालय : 9/1, आर. एन. मुन्शी रोड, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 2818 (भाग 2) --1971	
19. सी एम/एल-1275650 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	वि नाइहाटी जूट मिल कम्पनी लि., पो. आ. हजिनाग, 24-परगना (प. बं.), (कार्यालय : 7 हरे स्ट्रे, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 2580--1982	
20. सी एम/एल-1275751 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	ओ हनुमान इंडस्ट्रीज, 65 ए. जी. टी. रोड, लिजरा, हावड़ा-711204, (कार्यालय : 178, एच०जी० रोड, कलकत्ता-700007)	IS : 1161--1979	
21. सी एम/एल-1275852 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	कंडक्टर्स एण्ड इन्वेंस्ट्रीज लि. लिमिटेड, गोविन्दगार्ह हाउस, पोस्ट बाबत नं. 23, भरगांव-403601	IS : 398 (भाग 2)- 1976	
22. सी एम/एल-1275953 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	श्री राम स्टील रोलिंग मिल, कोल्हाट रोड, पावर हाउस के नजदीक धाना (कार्यालय : तीतरा फ्लोर, पोलिश इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, एयम यनियन जे मिज बवाखाना, बम्बई-400010)	IS : 1786--1979	
23. सी एम/एल-1276046 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	जनरल इन्वेंस्ट्रीज एण्ड इन्वेस्टमेंट लि. प्लाट नं. ई. -1, इंड. एरिया, धाना-4000604 (कार्यालय : निजी हाउस बानोहरबास सुब्रह्मणाथ मार्ग, (रेवेन्यू स्ट्रीट), बम्बई-400001)	IS : 814 (भाग 2) --1974	
24. सी एम/एल-1276147 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1980-02-15	अडधानी प्रोलिफन लिमिटेड, बी-3, एन आई बी सी एरिया, उ नागर-मनन रोड, अहमदनगर-414001 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 814 (भाग 2) --1974	
25. सी एम/एल-1276248 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	बीजे मेटल प्रोडक्ट्स प्रा. लि., भरलापुर रोड, बुडीगल गाँव, गेडवत सा., रंगारोड्डी जिला, (कार्यालय : 3, 5, 825 हेरगुड़ा, हेवराबाद)	IS : 3196--1974	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
26. सी एम/एल-1276349 1984-02-03	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	अनिल इंडस्ट्रीज, 21-23 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बीना (म. प्र.) (कार्यालय: सर्वोदय, स्वबायर, जिला)	IS : 9020--1979	
27. सी एम/एल-1276450 1984-12-17	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	गुरुदिल सिंह एण्ड संस, ग्यू ब्लॉक, जेल मंदिर रोड, पोस्ट आकित के सामने, शिवपुरी (म. प्र.)	IS : 9020--1979	
28. सी एम/एल-1276551 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1980-02-15	कै. नो. स. ब. इंजीनियर्स प्रा. लि., 13 ए, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, सांवर रोड, इंदौर (म. प्र.)	IS : 9020--1979	
29. सी एम/एल-1276652 1984-02-03	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	महंती मेटल प्राइवेट्स, महनीमवा रोड, ग्यू बस स्टैंड के सामने, रतलाम (म. प्र.)	IS : 9020--1979	
30. सी एम/एल-1276753 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	कानपुर रिकाइनरोज, 25, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, आजमू, कानपुर (उ. प्र.) (कार्यालय : 16/20-ए, सिविल लाइम्स, कानपुर-208001)	IS : 4654--1974	
31. सी एम/एल-1276854 1984-02-09	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	पंचमहल प्लास्टिक प्रा. लि., प्लॉट नं. 135, बैकम्पवाडी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, मंगलौर-575011, (कार्यालय : राम- बुर्गी), अहमके, बंगलौर-575003)	IS : 4985--1981	
32. सी एम/एल-1276953 1984-02-09	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	अजरंगबली रो रोलिंग मिल्स, पो. आ. बांगवाड़ीगांव, हिजुगुड़ी तिनसुखिया (असम), (कार्यालय : जी एन. बारजोलाई रोड, पो. आ. तिनसुखिया, असम)	IS : 226--1975	
33. सी एम/एल-1277048 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	अतरानी ट्यूब्स (प्रा.) लि., प्लॉट नं., 45-47, इंडस्ट्रियल डवलपमेंट एरिया, फेज 4, आई. डी. ए., पाटनचौर, जिला मेहक (आ. प्र.) (कार्यालय : 2208 हिल स्ट्रीट, रामीगंज, सिकन्दराबाद-500003)	IS : 1161--1979	
34. सी एम/एल-1277149 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	श्री गणेश स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, 14-ए इनौर हाई रोड, मद्रास-600019	IS : 226--1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
35. सीएम/एल-1277350 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	इलेक्ट्रिकल केबल्स एण्ड कंडक्टरर्स, (तिरुपुरा), कुमारघाट इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, पो. आ. कुमारघाट, तिरुपुरा नार्थ	IS : 398 (भाग 2)— 1976	
36. सीएम/एल-1277351 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	बौधरो मंडल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा.) लि., प्लॉट 71, सेक्टर, 6, फरीदाबाद	IS : 2465—1965	
37. सीएम/एल-1277452 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	स्टील प्रॉपर्टी प्राफ इंडिया लि., (राउरकेला स्टील प्लांट), राउरकेला-769011 (उड़ीसा)	IS : 3889—1981	
38. सीएम/एल-1277553 1984-02-13	1994-03-01	1985-02-28	स्टारलिट केबल्स लिमिटेड, विट्ठलवाड़ी, विट्ठलवाड़ी रेलवे स्टेशन के मजबूक, विहासमगर-3 (जिला धाना)	IS : 398 (भाग 2)— 1976	
39. सीएम/एल-1277654 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	ईस्टर्न स्टील एण्ड एलॉय कं. लि., सेक्टर रोड, पासगांव-783385, (असम) (कार्यालय : पबसारनियां, हूसरा पाइ लेम, गहाटी-781003)	IS : 6914—1978	
40. सीएम/एल-1277755 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	"	IS : 6915—1978	
41. सीएम/एल-1277856 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	स्टेलाइट केबल्स लिमिटेड, 7-किरोल विद्याविहार (प.), घाटकोपर, बम्बई-400086	IS : 9857—1981	
42. सीएम/एल-127957 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	भारत शॉ मिल्स, मुडिकल, पो. आ. पैरम्बावर	IS : 10 (भाग 3)— 1974	
43. सीएम/एल-1278050 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	रूपा केमिकल्स, 136/6, जी. आई. बी. सी. इस्टेट, बपो-396195 (गुजरात)		
44. सीएम/एल-1278151 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	एम. एस. आर. ग्लास इंडस्ट्रीज, बो-84, सेक्टर-5, नोएडा, जिला गाजियाबाद (कार्यालय : बो-209/1, नरायणा इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फेज-I, नई दिल्ली-110028)	IS : 1223 (भाग 1)—1970	
45. सीएम/एल-1278252 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	बंगलौर पेस्टोसाइड्स लिमिटेड, 16वां मोल, दुमकुर रोड, बंगलौर-560073 (कार्यालय : 33 सांके रोड, कोल, बंगलौर-560052)	IS : 8028—1976	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
46. सीएम/एल-1278353 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	राजलक्ष्मी इंडस्ट्रीज, विद्यापुर, पो. धा. नया बाजार, कटक-753004 (उड़ीसा)	IS : 1011—1981	
47. सीएम/एल-1278454 1984-02-09	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	विराग इंटरप्राइज, एफ-123, मरुधर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, वासमी, फेज II, जोधपुर	IS : 4985—1981	
48. सीएम/एल-1278555 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	जे. बी. मांगेराम एण्ड कम्पनी, पो. धा. रेजीडेन्सी, ग्वालियर- 474005 (भोपाल)	IS : 1011—1981	
49. सीएम/एल-1278656 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	मारबन मिनिस्ट्रल्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, दौलताबाद रोड, गङ्गावा (हरियाणा) (कार्यालय : 278, कटरा पेराम, तिलक बाजार, दिल्ली-110006)	IS : 5277—1978	
50. सीएम/एल-1278757 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	पेट्रो केमि. इंडिया, 320, कारावल नगर, सोमी रोड, शाहदारा, दिल्ली-110094 (कार्यालय : 966-967, गली तेलियान, नावट्टी सिनेमा के पीछे, दिल्ली-110006)	IS : 2569—1978	
51. सीएम/एल-1278858 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एप्रो केमिकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, पूनामाली प्रवाड़ी रोड, कडवेटटी, मवास-600077 (कार्यालय : प्लाट नं. 4231, ब्लाक टी-45, अन्ना नगर, मवास-600040)	IS : 2865—1978	
52. सीएम/एल-1278959 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एस. के. सामी एण्ड संस, सामी इन्डस्ट्रीस इंडस्ट्रियल कॉ., 4/बी वेल्डरार्ड रोड, ऐरोड-638009 (कार्यालय : पो. बी. नं. 140, 55, सादो रोड, ऐरोड-638001)	IS : 561—1978	
53. सीएम/एल-1279052 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	विजय श्री स्पॉन्सिंग मिस्ट प्रा. लि., विजो रोड, बिम्बोगुल-624009 (तमिल नाडु)	IS : 834—1975	
54. सीएम/एल-1279153 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एपीकल्वर इंडस्ट्रीज (I), प्रभात चौक, जालंधर रोड, होशियारपुर-146001 (पंजाब)	IS : 9020—1979	
55. सीएम/एल-1279254 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	इंडियन ह्यूमने पाइप कं. लि., 115, महात्मा गांधी मार्ग, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)	IS : 458—1971	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
56. सीएम/एल-1279355 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	ग्रान्ध सीमेंट कं. लि., (बिसाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स), पोरलूबेलम गांव, बिसाखापल्लम-530029	IS : 1489-1976	
57. सीएम/एल-1279456 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	होनी इंडस्ट्रियल कारपोरेशन, 32-बीरबानी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, वेस्टर्न एक्सप्रेस हाइवे, गोरेगांव (ई) बम्बई-400063	IS : 781-1977	
58. सीएम/एल-1279557 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	"	IS : 1703-1977	
59. सीएम एल-1279658 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	"	IS : 1795-1974	
60. सीएम/एल-1279795 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	त्रिवरी रोलिंगमिल्स वासनाला, पो. आ. पत्थरडी, जिला धनबाद (कार्यालय : 23ए, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, (8वां तल), कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 1786-1979	
61. सीएम/एल-1279860 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	प्रकाश री-रोलिंग मिल्स, जय कृष्णा रोड पो. आ. बेगलपुर, पटना सिटी-800009	IS : 226-1975	
62. सीएम/एल-1279961 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	—वही—	IS : 1786-1979	
63. सीएम/एल-1280037 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	फाले एण्ड रे (फाउंडर एण्ड इंजीनियर्स) प्रा. लिमिटेड, 32 फोरसोप रोड, हायड्रा-711103, (कार्यालय : बीई 373, साइलोक सिटी, कलकत्ता-64)	IS : 1538 (भाग 1 से 23)—1976	
64. सीएम/एल-1280138 1984-02-15	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	इंटरनेशनल सेल्स प्रॉमोशन, बु. नं.-1-2 दिन रोड, टी.टी. नगर, भोपाल ।	IS : 780-1980	
65. सीएम/एल-1280239	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	केमिकल एण्ड इंस्टीट्यूट्स, रामनगर, करंजा पो. आ. भंसा, रेलवे स्टेशन, कुस्मी गोरखपुर (यूपी) (कार्यालय : साराफ चेम्बर, हिन्दी बस्तर, (गोरखपुर)	IS : 3903-1975	
66. सीएम/एल-1280340 1984-02-15	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एम. पी. स्टेड एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज डवलपमेंट कं. लि., पेस्टीसाइड्स कार्पोरेशन प्लांट, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बीना (म.प्र.) (कार्यालय : 3सरा तल "पंचामन" मालवीय नगर, भोपाल ।	IS : 2568-1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
67. सीएम/एल-1280441 1984-02-15	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	इंदरनेशनल स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, जलंधर रोड, होशियारपुर- 146001 (पंजाब)	IS : 9020-1979	
68. सीएम/एल-1280542 1984-02-15	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	नेशनल केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, ई-20, बसंत मार्ग, बनी पार्क, जयपुर-302006 (राजस्थान)	IS : 393-1975	
69. सीएम/एल-1280643 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	नेशनल री रोलिंग मिल्स, बाबा स्टील बिल्डिंग्स, रेलवे स्टेशन के सामने, कंपटी-441001 जिला नागपुर (कार्यालय : 88 कभाल रोड, रामदासपेठ, नागपुर-400010)	IS : 1786-1979	
70. सीएम/एल-1280744 1984-02-16	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	एकूटे पाइप एण्ड प्लास्टिक्स प्रा. लि., ए.-193, मेवाड़ इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, उदयपुर।	IS : 4985 -1981	
71. सीएम/एल-1280845 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	श्री श्रीनिवास सिलिंडर प्रा. लि., 39-एम जी द्वार साले पालाभाक्कम, मद्रास-600041 (कार्यालय : 40 एमजीद्वार साले पालाभाक्कम, मद्रास-600041)	IS : 3196-1974	
72. सीएम/एल-1280946 1984-02-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	लारसेन एण्ड ट्यूबरो लि., एवारपुर सीमेंट वर्क्स, पो. आ. चंदरापुर, (महाराष्ट्र) (कार्यालय : सीमेंट मार्किट बाकटवार, 12वीं तल, नारिमन प्वाइंट, बम्बई-21)	IS : 1489-1976	
73. सीएम/एल-1281039 1984-02-18	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	श्री शक्ति सिलिंडर प्रा. लि., प्लॉट 10-ए एण्ड 10बी, फेज III, आईडीए जीडिमेडला, हैदराबाद-500854 कार्यालय : 12-2-823/ए/16 संतोष नगर, हैदराबाद)	IS : 3196-1974	
74. सीएम/एल-1281140 1984-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	यूनिवर्सल ट्रेड्स, खसरा नं., 299, गोकलपुर, शाहबरा, दिल्ली-110032	IS : 691-1966	
75. सीएम/एल-1281241 1984-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एम. पी. स्टेट एंड इंडस्ट्रियल डेव, कार, लि., सेमी पुरबन इंडस्ट्रियल हस्टेड, बीमा (मध्य प्रदेश) (कार्यालय : पंचानन भवन न्यू मार्किट, टी. टी. नगर, भोपाल-3)	IS : 7122-1983	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
76. सीएम/एल-1281342 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	सेठी इंजी. वर्क्स, मैजैस्टिक रोड, सोगा	IS : 9020-1979	
77. सीएम/एल-1281443 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	शिवास इंडस्ट्रीज, इंद्रा मिलस कम्पाउंड, जोनी मंडी, आगरा-282004	IS : 6595-1980	
78. सीएम/एल-1281544 1984-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	इंडो गैरमन एप्रीकल्चरल स्प्रेयर एण्ड प्रेसिंग वर्क्स, 1. जवासर मार्किट लुधियाना (पंजाब) (कार्यालय: चंबा सिनेमा के मजबूक, लुधियाना)	IS : 3062-1982	
79. सीएम/एल-1281645 1984-02-18	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	हिन्दुस्तान एप्री कल्चरल फार्पोरेशन, मैजैस्टिक रोड, सोगा-142001 (पंजाब)	IS : 9020-1979	
80. सीएम/एल-1281746 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	विकास इलेक्ट्रोड्स प्रा. लि., 6-7 एमआईडीसी एरिया, टिबाक रोड, सतपुर नासिक-422007	IS : 814(भाग 2) -1974	
81. सीएम/एल-1281847 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	—वही—	IS : 814 (भाग 1) -1974	
82. सीएम/एल-1281948 1984-02-21	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	स्यू स्टील वर्क इंडस्ट्रीज सी-18 गणेश नगर, नई दिल्ली	IS : 9562; 1980	
83. सीएम/एल-1282041 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-29	भारत वाहन एण्ड इंजीनियरिंग कं. बाला यूनिट, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बाला मुजफ्फरपुर (कार्यालय: 66 पाटलीपुत्र कालोनी), पटना-800013)	IS : 3196-1974	
84. सीएम/एल-1282142 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	पेटोगा (इंसुलेशन एण्ड पैकेजिंग) लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नं. बी./27 एण्ड बी/27/1, एम आई डीसी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, हिमगामा रोड, नागपुर-440016 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 5086; 1981	
85. सीएम/एल-1282243 1984-07-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	करकोल प्रा. लि., बी-16 एमआईडीसी इस्टेट, होसर-635126	IS : 2171-1976	
86. सीएम/एल-1282344 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	बंगाल रबर एण्ड प्लास्टिक वर्क्स, 66 तिलआसा रोड, कलकत्ता-700046 (वेस्ट बंगाल)	IS : 3976-1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
87. सीएम/एल-1282445 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	नेशनल जूट मैनु. कारपोरेशन, लिमिटेड, (यूनिट : यूनियन) 12 कैमबेट लेन, कलकत्ता-700015 (पश्चिम बंगाल) (कार्यालय: चारटेड बैंक बिल्डिंग 4, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 2818 (भाग 2) 1971	
88. सीएम/एल-1282546 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	नेशनल जूट मैनु. कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (यूनिट : यूनियन) 12 कैमबेट लेन, कलकत्ता-700015 (पश्चिम बंगाल) (कार्यालय : चारटेड बैंक बिल्डिंग 4, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 2818(भाग 3) -1971	
89. सीएम/एल-1282647 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	द्वि रंभावामी जूट कं. लि., (यूनिट: बिलिंगटन जूट मिल्स), पो. आ. शिहसं, जिला-बुगलो (कार्यालय : 25 प्रोन्सिप स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700002)	IS : 2580-1982	
90. सीएम/एल-1282748 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	श्री किन्टसं, 78-बी, रामेहा कालोनी मेन रोड, तिरुपुरा-638602 (तमि.) (कार्यालय : 8ए/10 रायपापुरम ईस्ट स्ट्रीट, तिरुपुरा-638601)	IS : 4964-1980	
91. सीएम/एल-128249 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	जयपाल उद्योग, 33-35 राजल इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, लोनी डिस्ट्रिक्ट गाजियाबाद (उ.प्र.) (कार्यालय : 302 आकाशवीप, बारखाना रोड, नई दिल्ली-110001)	IS : 561-1978	
92. सीएम/एल-1282950 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	„	IS : 562-1978	
93. सीएम/एल-1283043 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	सनरे केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, मोती लाल नेहरू रोड, जमुना किनारा, आगरा-282004 (उत्तर प्रदेश)	IS : 393-1975	
94. सीएम/एल-1283144 1984 02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एंग्लो डब पेंट कलर एण्ड वार्निश वर्क्स प्रा. लि., 50 शिवाजी मार्ग, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-110015	IS : 133-1975	
95. सीएम/एल-1283245 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	एस.एन. केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज बी-25 गवर्न इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, महरोली रोड, गुडगांव-122001 (कार्यालय : डीडीए, शेड नं. 90, श्रीखला इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, फेज II), नई दिल्ली-110020)	IS : 561-1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
96. सीएम/एल-1283346 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	ए.पी. इंडस्ट्रीज, 52-ए, प्रोजेक्ता इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली, 110020	IS : 4246-1978	
97. सीएम/एल-1283447 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	चौधरी, मंटल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा.) लि. प्लॉट नं. 71, सेक्टर-6, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)	IS : 8783-1978	
98. सीएम/एल-1283548 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	इलेक्ट्रिक केबल इंडस्ट्रीज, पंचायत घर के सामने, आबरपुर, शाहपुरा, दिल्ली-110032	IS : 5950-1971	
99. सीएम/एल-1283649 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	मंजू इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज लि., 12वां मील पोलाची रोड, मलमचामपट्टी पोस्ट; कोयंबटूर-641021	IS : 996-1964	
100. सीएम/एल-1283750 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	धनूत बिस्कुट्स (प्रा.) लिमिटेड, बी-232, रोड नं. 9, बोकेघाई जयपुर-302013 (कार्यालय : 55 हथोरी फोर्ट, जयपुर-302001)	IS : 1011-1981	
101. सीएम/एल-1283851 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	फोमडन प्रेस लिमिटेड, बैडप बसर्स, मधीन 4, डिवीजन, साल बहादुर शास्त्री मार्ग, कनजूर मार्ग, बम्बई-400078	IS : 2148-1968	
102. सीएम/एल-1283952 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	भार.एस. फाउन्ड्री एण्ड इंग बसर्स, जी.टी. रोड, घाय पास इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट के मजदीक, जलंधर-144004	IS : 1879-1975	
103. सीएम/एल-1284045 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	वि साइनिडेट एण्ड विगमेट्स लि., (ए टाटा इंटरप्राइजेज) शफवी, बुलबुर्डा, रेलवे स्टेशन रोड, जमशेदपुर-831002 (कार्यालय : 43 बीरगी रोड, कलकत्ता-700071)	IS : 44-1969	
104. सीएम/एल-1284146 1984-04-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	कावेरी केनिकल्स प्रा.लि., तिरुनूलापुरम, तिरुवाला-689101 (केरल)	IS : 261-1982	

[सं. सी एम डी/13 : 11]

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, the 17th October, 1986

S.O. 3793 —In pursuance of subregulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that one hundred and four licences, par

culars of which are given in the following schedule, have been granted during the month of February 1984 authorising the licencees to use the Standards Marks :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. (CM/L-)	Period of validity		Name and address of the licensee	IS : Designation
		from	To		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	CM/L-1273848 1984-02-02	1984-02-01	1984-01-31	Swadesh Enterprises & Chemical India, 111/108-A, Pokharpurwa, Kanpur-208007 (Office : 26/50, Birhana Road, Kanpur-208001)	IS : 562—1978
2.	CM/L-1273949 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Vimco Industries, 13-F, Industrial Area, Govindpura, Bhopal-462023 (MP)	IS : 2339—1963
3.	CM/L-1274042 1984-01-25	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	Pradeshik Co-operative Dairy Federation Limited, Cattle Feed Plant, Gangol Road, Paraspur, Meerut (UP)	IS : 2052—1979
4.	CM/L-1274143 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Kanoria Alkalies & Plastics Ltd, Plot No. 7, Site No. 4 Sahibabad Industrial Area, Ghaziabad (UP)	IS : 561—1978
5.	CM/L-1274244 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Mahatma Wire Products, 15, Industrial Estate, Jammu-180003	IS : 398 (Part II)—1976
6.	CM/L-1274345 1984-02-02	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Crumb Rubber Factory, The Kozhikode District Co-operative Rubber Marketing Society Limited, Kuppayakode P.O. Kozhikode Distt-673580 (Kerala)	IS : 4588—1977
7.	CM/L-1274446 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Northern Minerals Pvt. Limited Daulatabad Road, Gurgaon (Office : 278-Katra Peran, Tilak Bazar, Delhi-110006)	IS : 8028—1976
8.	CM/L-1274547 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	APT (Delhi) Engineering Pvt. Ltd C-38/1 Ashok Vihar Industrial Area, Delhi-110052	IS : 4246—1978
9.	CM/L-1274648 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Silver Flame Appliances, 60/11, D.L.F. Industrial Area I, Faridabad-121003 (Haryana)	IS : 4246—1978
10.	CM/L-1274749 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Northern Steel Industries, G.T. Road, Lal Kuan, Heavy Industrial Area, No. 1, Ghaziabad-201009	IS : 1729—1979
11.	CM/L-1274850 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Wylex Industries, 5 New Wazirpur Industrial Complex, Delhi-110052	IS : 3854—1966
12.	CM/L-1274951 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Choudhary Metal Industries (P) Ltd, Plot 71, Sector 6, Faridabad-121006	IS : 5950—1971
13.	CM/L-1275044 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Somex India, WZ-143, Mahavir Nagar, New Delhi-110018	IS : 694—1977
14.	CM/L-1275145 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Gilton Cables (India) D-57, Sector-6, NOIDA Distt. Ghaziabad (UP)	IS : 694—1977
15.	CM/L-1275246 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Kukreja Transformer Mfg Co., A-9, Wazirpur Industrial Area, New Delhi-110052	IS : 9857—1981
16.	CM/L-1275347 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Ace Cable Industries Pvt.Ltd, Street No. 8 Samepur, Badli, Delhi-110042	IS : 5950—1971
17.	CM/L-1275448 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Assam Oil Division) Digboi Refinery P.O. Digboi-78617 (Assam)	IS : 4654—1974
18.	CM/L-1275549 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Birla Jute & Inds. Limited, Unit : Birla Jute Mill, P.O. Birlapur Distt 24-Parganas (WB) (Office : 9/1 R.N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-700001)	IS : 2818 (Part II)—1974
19.	CM/L-1275650 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	The Birla Jute Mills Company Ltd. P.O. Hazinag, 24 Parganas (WB) (Office : 7 Hare St. Calcutta-700001)	IS : 2580—1982
20.	CM/L-1275751 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Shree Hanuman Industries, 65A, G.T. Road, Lilloah, Howrah-711204 (Office : 178 M.G. Road, Calcutta-700007)	IS : 1161—1979
21.	CM/L-1275852 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Conductors & Electricals Mfg. Co. Limited, Govind Poy House, Post Box No. 23 Margao-403601	IS : 398(Part II)—1976
22.	CM/L-1275953 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Shree Ram Steel Rolling Mills, Kolshet Road, Near Power House, Thana (Office : 3rd Floor, Poria Industrial Estate, above Union Weigh Bridge, Darukhana, Bombay-400010)	IS : 1786—1979

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
23. CM/L-1276046 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	General Electrodes & Equipment Ltd. Plot No. E-1, Indl. Area, Thana-4000604 (Office : Jiji House, Damodardas Sukhadwala Marg, (Raveline Street) Bombay-400001)	IS : 814 (Part II)—1974	
26. CM/L-1276147 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Advani Oerlikon Limited, B-5, MIDC Area, Nagar-Manmad Road, Ahmednagar-414001 (Maharashtra)	IS : 814 (Part II)—1974	
25. CM/L-1276248 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Veejay Metal Products Pvt. Ltd. Narsapur Road, Dundigal Village Medchal Tq., Rangareddy District (Office : 3.5.825 Hyderguda, Hyderabad)	IS : 3196—1976	
26. CM/L-1276349 1984-02-03	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	Anil Industries, 21-23 Industrial Estate, Bina (MP) (Office : Sarvodaya Square, Bina)	IS : 9020—1979	
27. CM/L-1274450 1986-02-03	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	Gurdial Singh & Sons, New Block, Jai Mandir Road, Opp. Post Office, Shivpuri (MP)	IS : 9020—1979	
28. CM/L-1274551 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Chemofab Engineers Pvt. Ltd. 13/A Industrial Area, Sanwer Road, Indore (MP)	IS : 9020—1979	
29. CM/L-1276652 1984-02-03	1984-02-01	1985-01-31	Multi Metal Products, Mhow Neemuch Road, Opp. New Bus Stand, Ratlam (MP)	IS : 9020—1979	
30. CM/L-1276753 1984-02-03	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Kanpur Refractories, 25, Industrial Estate, Jajmu, Kanpur (UP) (Office : 16/20-A, Civil Lines, Kanpur-208001)	IS : 4654—1974	
31. CM/L-1276854 1984-02-09	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Panchmal Plastics Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. 135 Bajkampady Industrial Area, Mangalore-575011 (Office : 'Ram Durga', Alke, Mangalore-575003)	IS : 4985—1981	
32. CM/L-1276955 1984-02-09	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Bajrangbali Re-rolling, Mills, P.O. Bansbari Gaon, Hijuguri, Tinsukia (Assam) (Office : G.N. Bardoloi Road, P.O. Tinsukia, Assam)	IS : 226—1975	
33. CM/L-1277048 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Asrani Tubes (P) Ltd., Plot No. 45-47, Industrial Development Area, Phase IV, I.D.A. Patancheru Distt. Medak (AP) (Office : 2206 Hill Street Raniganj, Secunderabad-500003)	IS : 1161—1979	
34. CM/L-1277149 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Shree Ganesh Steel Rolling Mills, 14-A Ennore High Road, Madras-600019	IS : 226—1975	
35. CM/L-1277350 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Electrical Cables & Conductors (Tripura), Kumarghat Industrial Estate, P.O. Kumarghat, Tripura North	IS : 398 (Part II)—1976	
36. CM/L-1277351 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Coudhari Metal Industries (P) Limited, Plot 71, Sector-6, Faridabad	IS : 2465—1965	
37. CM/L-1277452 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Steel Authority of India Ltd., (Rourkela Steel Plant) Rourkela-769001 (Orissa)	IS : 3589—1981	
38. CM/L-1277553 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sterlite Cables Limited, Vithalwadi, Near Vithalwadi, Rly. Station, Vithalnagar-3 (Distt. Thana)	IS : 398 (Part II)—1976	
39. CM/L-1277654 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Eastern Steel & Alloys Co. Ltd. Lateral Road, Dhallgaon-783385 (Assam) (Office : Pub Sarania, (2nd by lane) Gauhati-781003)	IS : 6914—1978	
40. CM/L-1277755 1984-2-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	do-	IS : 6915—1978	
41. CM/L-1277856 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sterlite Cables Limited 7 Kirol Vidyavihar (W) Ghatkopar, Bombay-400086	IS : 9857—1981	
42. CM/L-127957 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Bharat Saw Mills, Mudikal, P.O. Perumbavoor	IS : 10 (Part III)—1984	
43. CM/L-1278050 1984-12-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Rupa Chemicals, 136/6, G.I.D.C. Estate, Vapi-396195 (Gujarat)	IS : 4955—1982	
44. CM/L-1278151 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	S.S.R. Glass Industries, B-94 Sector-5, Noida, Distt Ghaziabad (Office : B-209/1, Naraina Industrial Area, Phase I, New Delhi-110028)	IS : 1223 (Part I)—1970	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
45.	CM/L-1278252 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Bangalore Pesticides Limited, 16th Km, Tumkur Road, Bangalore-560073 (Office : 33 Sankey Road Cross, Bangalore-560052)	IS : 8028—1976
46.	CM/L-1278353 1984-02-13	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Rajlaxmi Industries, Baidyadharpur, P.O. Nayabazar, Cuttack-753004 (Orissa)	IS : 1011—1981
47.	CM/L-1278454 1984-02-09	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Chirag Enterprises, F-1 23, Marudhar Industrial Area, Bansi, Phase II, Jodhpur	IS : 4985—1981
48.	CM/L-1278555 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	J.B. Mangharam & Company, (P.O. Residency-Gwalior-474005 (Bhopal)	IS : 1011—1981
49.	CM/L-1278656 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-12-15	Northern Minerals Pvt. Limited Daultabad Road, Gurgaon (Haryana) (Office : 278, Katra Peran, Tilak Bazar, Delhi-110006)	IS : 5277—1978
50.	CM/L-1278757 1984-02-14	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Pesto Chem India, 320, Karawal Nagar, Loni Road, Shahdra, Delhi-110094 (Office : 966967, Gali Tellan, Behind Novelty Cinema, Delhi-110006)	IS : 2569—1978
51.	CM/L-1278858 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Agro Chemical Industries, Poonamallee Avadi Road, Kaduvetty, Madras-600077 (Office : Pilot No. 4231, Block T-45, Anna Nagar, Madras-600040)	IS : 2865—1978
52.	CM/L-1278959 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	S.K. Samy & Sons, Samy Insecticides Co., 4/B, Perundurai Road, Erode-638009 (Office : P.B. No. 140, 55, Sathy Road, Erode-638001)	IS : 561—1978
53.	CM/L-1279052 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Vijayshree Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited, Trichy Road, Dindigul-624009 (TN)	IS : 834—1975
54.	CM/L-1279153 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Agriculture Industries (I), Prabhat Chowk, Jalandhar Road, Hoshiarpur-146001 (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979
55.	CM/L-1279254 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Indian Hume Pipe Co. Ltd., 115 Mahatma Gandhi Marg, Allahabad (UP)	IS : 458—1971
56.	CM/L-1279355 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Andhra Cement Co. Ltd., (Visakha Cement Works) Porlupalem Village, Visakhapatnam-530029	IS : 1489—1976
57.	CM/L-1279456 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Honey Indl. Corpn., 32 Virwani Industrial Estate, Western Express Highway Coregaon (E) Bombay-400063	IS : 781—1977
58.	CM/L-1279557 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	-do-	IS : 1703—1977
59.	CM/L-1279658 1984-02-14	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	-do-	IS : 1795—1974
60.	CM/L-1279759 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sindri Rolling Mills, Chasnala, P.O. Pathradih, Distt. Dhanbad (Office : 23A, Netaji Subhas Road, (8th floor) Calcutta-700001)	IS : 1786—1979
61.	CM/L-1279860 1984-12-17,	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Prakash Re-rolling Mills, Jai Krishna Road, P.O. Begumpur, Patna City-800009	IS : 226—1975
62.	CM/L-1279961 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Prakash Re-rolling Mills, Jai Krishna Road, P.O. Begumpur, Patna City-800009	IS : 1786—1979

(1)	(2)	(3)	(6)	(5)	(6)
63. CM/L-1280037 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Crawley & Ray (Founders and Engineers) Pvt. Limited, 32 Foreshore Road, Howrah-711103 (Office : BE 373, Salt lake City, Calcutta-64)	IS : 1538 (Part I to XXIII)—1976	
64. CM/L-1280138 1984-02-15	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	International Sales Organization, Shop No. 1-2 Tin Shed, T.T. Nagar, Bhopal	IS : 780—1980	
65. CM/L-1280239 1984-02-15	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Chemicals & Insecticides, Ram Nagar, Karanjha P.O. Bhaishaha, Rly Station, Kusmhi Gorakhpur (UP) (Office : Saraf Chamber, Hindi Basar, Gorakhpur)	IS : 3903—1975	
66. CM/L-1280340 1984-02-15	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	M.P. State Agro Industries Development Co Ltd. Pesticides Formulation Plant, Industrial Estate, Bina (MP) (Office : 3rd Floor "Panchanan" Malviya Nagar, Bhopal)	IS : 2568—1978	
67. CM/L-1280441 1984-02-15	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	International Steel Industries, Jalandhar Road, Hoshiarpur-146001 (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979	
68. CM/L-1280542 1984-02-15	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	National Chemical Industries, E-20, Basant Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur-302005 (Rajasthan)	IS : 393—1976	
69. CM/L-1280643 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	National Re-rolling Mills, Bawa Steel Buildings, Opp. Railway Station, Kamptee-441001, Distt. Nagpur (Office : 88 Caval Road, Ramdaspath, Nagpur-400010)	IS : 1786—1979	
70. CM/L-1280744 1984-02-16	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Accurate Pipes & Plastics Pvt. Ltd. A-193 Mewar Industrial Area, Udaipur	IS : 4985—1981	
71. CM/L-1280845 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sree Srinivas Cylinders Pvt. Ltd., 39, M.G.R. Salai Palavakkam, Madras-600041 (Office : 40 M.G.R. Salai Palavakkam, Madras-600041)	IS : 3196—1974	
72. CM/L-1280946 1984-02-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Larsen & Toubro Ltd, Awarpur Cement Works, P.O. Chandrapur (Maharashtra) (Off: Cement Mkt Bhaktawar, 12th Floor, Nariman Point, Bombay-21)	IS : 1489—1976	
73. CM/L-1281039 1984-02-18	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Shri Shakti Cylinders Pvt. Ltd. Plot 10-A & 10-B, Phase III, IDA Jeedimetla, Hyderabad-500854 (Off: 12-2-823/A/16, Sanatosh Nagar, Hyderabad).	IS : 3196—1974	
74. CM/L-1281140 1984-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Universal Traders Khara No. 299 Gokalpur, Shahdara, Delhi-110032	IS : 691—1966	
75. CM/L-1281241 1984-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	M.P. State Agro Industries Dev. Corpn. Ltd., Semi Urban Industrial Estate, Bina (MP) (Office: Panchanan Bhawan, New Market, T.T. Nagar, Bhopal-3)	IS : 7122—1973	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(6)	(5)	(6)
76.	CM/L-1281342 1984-12-17	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Sethi Engg. Works, Majestic Road Moga.	IS : 9020—1979
77.	CM/L-1281443 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Shivas Industries, Indra Mills Compound, Jcon Mandi, Agra-282004	IS : 6595—1980
78.	CM/L-1281544 1983-02-18	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Indo German Agricultural Sprayer & Pressing Works, 1 Jawahar Market, Ludhiana (Punjab) (Office: Near Chand Cinema, Ludhiana)	IS : 3062—1982
79.	CM/L-1281645 1984-02-18	1984-02-16	1985-02-15	Hindustan Agricultural Corporation, Majestic Road, Moga-142001 (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979
80.	CM/L-1281746 1984-1-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Vikas Electrodes Pvt. Ltd. 6-7 MIDC Area, Tibak Road, Satpur, Nasik-422007	IS : 814 (Part II)—1974
81.	CM/L-1281847 1984-12-17	1984-03-31	1985-02-28	Vikas Electrodes Pvt. Ltd. 6-7, MIDC Area, Tibak Road, Satpur, Nasik-422007	IS : 814 (Part I)-1974
82.	CM/L-1281948 1984-02-21	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	New Steel Bird Industries, C-18 Ganesh Nagar, New Delhi (Office : 2E/2 Jhandewalan Extension New Delhi)	IS : 9562—1980
83.	CM/L-1282041 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Bharat Wagon Engineering Co. Bela Unit, Industrial Estate, Bela Muzaferpur (Office : 65 Patliputra Colony, Patna-800013)	IS : 3196—1974
84.	CM/L-1282142 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Pepaga (Insulation & Packaging) Limited, Plot No B/27 & B/27/1, MIDC Industrial Area, Hingana Road, Nagpur-440016 (Maharashtra)	IS : 5086—1981
85.	CM/L-1282243 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Fyrkool P. Ltd B-16 SIDCO Estate, Hosur-635126	IS : 2171—1976
86.	CM/L-1282344 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Bengal Rubber & Plastic Works, 66 Tiljala Road, Calcutta-700046 (West Bengal)	IS : 3976—1975
87.	CM/L-1282445 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	National Jute Mfrs. Corporation Limited, (Unit : UNION) 12 Convent Lane, Calcutta-700015 (West Bengal) (Office : Chartered Bank Building, 4 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-700001)	IS : 2818 (Part II)— 1971
88.	CM/L-1282564 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	National Jute Mfrs Corporation Limited, (Unit : UNION) 12 Convent Lane, Calcutta-700015 (W.B.) (Office : Chartered Bank Building, 4 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-700001)	IS : 2818 (Part III)- 1971
89.	CM/L-1282647 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	The Champdany Jute Co Ltd., (Unit : Wellington Jute Mill), P.O. Rishra, Distt. Hooghly (Office : 25 Princep Street, Calcutta-700002)	IS : 2580—1982
90.	CM/L-1282748 1984-02-22	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sri Knitters, 78-B, Ramaiah Colony Main Road, Tirupur-638602 (TN) (Office : 8A/10 Rayappapuram East Street, Tirupur-638601)	IS : 4964—1980

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
91. CM/L-128249 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Jaipal Udyog, 33-35 Rural Industrial Estate, Loni Distt. Ghaziabad (UP) (Office : 302 Aksh Deep, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001)		IS : 551—1978
92. CM/L-1282950 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	-d.j.-		IS : 562—1978
93. CM/L-1283043 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Sunray Chemical Industries, Motilal Nehru Road, Jamuna Kinara, Agra-282004 (UP)		IS : 3903—1975
94. CM/L-1283144 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Anglo Dutch Paint Colour & Varnish Works Pvt. Ltd., 50 Shivaji Marg, Industrial Area, New Delhi-110015		IS : 133—1975
95. CM/L-1283245 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	S.N. Chemical Industries, B-25 Govt. Industrial Estate, Mehrauli Road, Gurgaon-122001 (Office : DDA, Shed No. 90, Okhla Industrial Estate, (Phase II), New Delhi-110020)		IS : 561—1978
96. CM/L-1283346 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	A Per Industries, 52-A, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110020		IS : 4246—1978
97. CM/L-1283447 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Choudhary Metal Industries (P) Ltd., Plot No. 71, Sector-6, Faridabad (Haryana)		IS : 8783—1978
98. CM/L-1283548 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Electric Cable Industries, Opp. Panchayat Ghar, Babarpur, Shahdara, Delhi-110032		IS : 5950—1971
99. CM/L-1283649 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Manju Electrical Industries Ltd., 12th KM Pollachi Road, Malumachampatti Post, Coimbatore-641021		IS : 996—1964
100. CM/L-1283750 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Amrit Bistuits (P) Limited, B-232, Road No. 9, VKIA, Jaipur-302013 (Office : 55 Hathroi Fort, Jaipur-302001)		IS : 1011—1981
101. CM/L-1283851 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Crompton Greave. Limited, Bandup Works, Machine IV Division, Lal Bahadur Shastri Marg, -Kanjur Marg, Bombay-400078		IS : 2148—1968
102. CM/L-1283952 1984-12-17	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	R.S. Foundry & Engg Works, G.T. Road Bye Pass Near Industrial Estate, Jalandhar-144004		IS : 1879—1975
103. CM/L-1284045 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	The Cyanides & Pigments Ltd. (A Tata Enterprise) Sakchi, Boulevard, Railway Station Road, Jamshedpur-831002 (Office : 43 Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-700071)		IS : 44—1969
104. CM/L-1284146 1984-02-24	1984-03-01	1985-02-28	Kaveri Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., Thiruvallapuram, Tiruvalla-689101 (Kerala)		IS : 261—1982

का. प्रा. 3794 : समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन मुहर) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 8 के उप-विनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था एतद्वारा अधिष्ठित करती है कि नीचे अनुसूची में जिन भारतीय मानकों के विवरण दिए गए हैं, वे मास जमवरी 1984 में प्रदान किए गए हैं और उन द्वारा लाइसेंसधारियों को मानक मुहर का प्रयोग करने को अधिकार प्रदान किया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या (सी एम/एल--)	संघता की अवधि		लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	भारतीय मानक सं.
		से	तक		
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	सी एम/एल-1262540 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	कोना इन्टरनेशनल (प्रा.) लि., सी-141, फेज 7, इंड. एरिया, मोहाली (पंजाब)	IS:1592-1980
2.	सी एम/एल-1262641 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	एशियन इन्डस्ट्रीज, 12/146-बी, प्राटो सेल्ज, मनहार्द के पीछे, आगरा - 282006 (कार्यालय 81, नार्थ बिजय नगर, कालोनी, आगरा 282004)	IS:6595-1980
3.	सी एम/एल-1262742 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	कनॉटक फॉरेस्ट प्लांटेशनज कार्पो. लि., के एस एफ सी लि., सुलिया डिविजन, सुलिया-574239 (कार्यालय : 15/94, प्लांटर्स लेन, मंगलोर - 575003)	IS:5430-1981
4.	सी एम/एल-1262843 1984-12-1	84-01-16	85-01-15	शक्तिवन मैनुफैक्चरर्स, 46-ई, भक्ति नगर इंड., इस्टेट, राजकोट- -360002	IS:10001-1981
5.	सी एम/एल-1262944 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	वेस्टर्न हार्डवेयर इंडस्ट्रीज, 13 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, छम्मम - 180010	IS: 398 (भाग 2) 1976
6.	सी एम/एल-1263037 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	इंडियन स्पन पाइप कं., विलेज पेट्रोस मुस्लामपुर के नजदीक, जिला रोपड़, (पंजाब)	IS:458-1971
7.	सी एम/एल-1263138 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	मौर्य उद्योग लिमिटेड, सोहना रोड (गौची घुंगी चौकी के नजदीक), सेक्टर 25, फरीदाबाद (कार्यालय : बी-231, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फेज 1, नई दिल्ली - 110020)	IS:3196-1975
8.	सी एम/एल-1263239 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	ए. के. कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मल्हापुरम, विशाखापत्तनम, 530011	IS:1786-1979
9.	सी एम/एल-1263340 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	ओ एण्ड एच लेबलान इलेक्ट्रोडस प्रा. लि., 44-46, इंड. इस्टेट, किला मंवाल इंदौर - 450006 (म. प्र.)	IS:814 (भाग 2) 1974
10.	सी एम/एल-1263441 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	क्रिओपेप प्लास्टिक्स प्रा. लि., प्लाट सं. 10, ब्लाक "सी", पिम्परी, बिजबाड़ इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बिजबाड़, पुणे - 411019	IS:7834 (भाग 6) 1975

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
11.	सी एम/एल-1263542 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	एकता इंजीनियर्स, ई-140, फोकल प्वाइंट, डांढ़ारी कला, लुधियाना	IS:778-1971
12.	सी एम/एल-126343 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	स्वास्तिक लाईव हाउस, 26/27, रामगोपाल इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, आर. पी. रोड, मुलुन्द (वेस्ट), बम्बई - 400080 (कार्यालय : 39/43, अब्दुल रहमान स्ट्रीट, दूसरी मंजिल, पाईधोन के नजदीक, बम्बई-400003)	IS:4308-1967
13.	सी एम/एल-1263744 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	इलेक्ट्राटेक इंडस्ट्रीज, 18, याणिविलास रोड, बसावनगुड़ी	IS:4159-1986
14.	सी एम/एल-1263845 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	स्पम पाईप प्लांट (आई डी सी ब्राफ उड़ीसा लि. की एक इकाई), मटकामवेड़, बाबिल, जिला बघोहर- 758036 (उड़ीसा)	IS:1536-1976
5.	सी एम/एल-1263946 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	माउर्न लेमिनेटर्स, सी-4, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, गोरखपुर- 273004	IS:4985-1981
16.	सी एम/एल-1264039 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	राक्षी निटर्स, 2/7, कांगूनगर सेन रोड तिरुपुर - 638607 (त. ना.)	IS:4964-1980
17.	सी एम/एल-1264140 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	भारत पेस्टीसाईड्स मैन्युफैक्चरिंग कं. ई-17, डीएस आई डी सी, इंडस्ट्रियल कम्प्लेक्स, रोहतक रोड, नांगलोई - दिल्ली-110014	IS:1308-1974
18.	सी एम/एल-1264241 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	जे. जी. बैक्यूस फ्लास्क लि., चिचवाड़, पुणे-411019 (महाराष्ट्र) (कार्यालय : दूसरी मंजिल, कोआप. इंशोरेंस बिल्डिंग, सर पी. एम. रोड, बम्बई - 400001)	IS:7708-1975
19.	सी एम/एल-1264342 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	जन जीवन फूड्स (प्रा.) लिमिटेड, बीबी नगर, तालुक भांगौर, जिला नलगोंडा (प्रा. प्र.)	IS:1485-1976
20.	सी एम/एल-1264443 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	जे. जी. बैक्यूस फ्लास्क लिमिटेड, चिचवाड़, पुणे-411019 (महाराष्ट्र) (कार्यालय : दूसरी मंजिल, को-आपरेटिव इंशोरेंस बिल्डिंग, सर पी. एम. रोड, बम्बई-400001)	IS:3702-1975
21.	सी एम/एल-1264544 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	रायल मेकेनिकल, वर्क्स जी. टी. रोड मलोट (पंजाब)	IS:9020-1979
22.	सी एम/एल-1264645 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	जे के जूट मिल्स कं. लिमिटेड, कालपी रोड, फजलगंज, कानपुर (उ. प्र.)	IS:2580-1982
23.	सी एम/एल-1264746 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	विन्नी लिमिटेड इंजीनियरिंग डिविजन मीनाम्बक्कम, मद्रास-600061 (त. ना.)	IS:9555-1980

1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	सी एम/एल-1264847 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	सिपला इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, उल्हू जेड नं. 1, गांव खयाला, नई दिल्ली 110018	IS:2312-1967
25.	सी एम/एल-1264948 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	साउथर्न एंटरप्राइजेज (गैस एप्लायंसेज नं. 10 थर्ड स्ट्रीट (ईस्ट), आर ई नगर, पोरूर, मद्रास— 602104 (त. ना)	IS:4246; 1978
26.	सी एम/एल-1265041 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	रामा स्टील ट्यूब प्रा. लि., बी-21, साईट नं. 4 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, सर्जहबाव (उ. प्र.) [कार्यालय : 6 बिसन मार्किट, (बूसरी मंजिल) 2897 सिखीबालान होजकाजी दिल्ली-110006]	IS:1239 (भाग 1) -1979
27.	सी एम/एल-1265142 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	स्वेन एंटरप्राइजेज, डी-166, एलैटिड फेक्टरीज कॉम्प्लेक्स भोखला इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट कं. नजवीक, भोखला, नई दिल्ली-110020	IS:4246-1978
28.	सी एम/एल-1265243 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	हाइड्रोबाल्वज हाउस नं. 125, गांव पीतपुरा, दिल्ली 110034	IS:4246-1978
29.	सी एम/एल-1265344 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	जेयको प्रोसिज इंडिया, ए-8/1, सिलमिस, ताहिरपुर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया शाहबरा, दिल्ली - 110032 (कार्यालय : 5/69, बजबाजार, शाहबरा, दिल्ली 110032)	IS:4246-1978
30.	सी एम/एल-1265445 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	लक्ष्मी इंजीनियरिंग वर्कस, बावड़ी, कुंभरबाड़, कं. सामने दिवाहा रोड, बडीबा-390004 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 4246-1978
31.	सी एम/एल-1265446 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	एसोसिएटेड सीमेंट कं. लि., मोरेरियल सीमेंट वर्क्स डाकघर सांजे रियल सीमेंट वर्क्स-504209 मोरेरियल (दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे) जिला भ्राविलाबाव (आ. प्र.)	IS:1489-1976
32.	सी एम/एल-1265647 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	आर्थोटेक्स 78-बी (1) रमेया कलोमी मेन रोड, तिनेपुर-638602 (त. ना)	IS:4964-1980
33.	सी एम/एल-1265748 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	श्री लक्ष्मी टेक्स्टाइल्स, 5(1), पी एन रोड तिरुपुर-638602 (त. ना)	IS:4964-1980
34.	सी एम/एल-1265849 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	ए वन निर्दिष्ट कं., 14, सिडको इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, हावे रोड, तिरुपुर-638602 (त. ना.)	IS:4964-1980
35.	सी एम/एल-1265950 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	श्री लक्ष्मी पेंटस एंड कनिशि वर्क्स, बी-3, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, गुंडुर-522002 (आ. प्र.) (कार्यालय : पटनाम बाजार, गुंडुर-522003)	IS:123-1962

1	2	3	4	5	6
36.	सी एम/एल-1266043 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	स्पेशल स्टील लिमिटेड, एक-8, तारापुरा इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जिला थाणे 401506 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS:1786-1979
37.	सी एम/एल-1266144 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	जे के प्रायसन एंड स्टील कं लिमिटेड, कालपी रोड, फजल गंज, कानपुर कार्यालय : कमला टावर (कानपुर)	IS:1786-1979
38.	सी एम/एल-1266245 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	साठी स्टील कार्पोरेशन, 571-ए, भूतौवाली गली, नांगलोई गांव, नई बिल्ली, (फाटक बांसवाला के सामने बाजार सीताराम, बिल्ली 110003)	IS:1341-1981
39.	सी एम/एल-1266346 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	एपो केमिकल्स एक-214,215, रोड सं. 10, बी के आई एरिया, जयपुर 302013 (कार्यालय : डी-6, संगल भवन, चांदपोल ग्रेन मार्केट, (जयपुर)	IS:8960-1978
40.	सी एम/एल-1266447 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	"	IS:2865-1978
41.	सी एम/एल-1266548 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	अलम पाइप्ट, 4वां मील गुडगांव जयपुर रोड, गांव खिरकी बीला, जिला गुडगांव (कार्यालय : ई-147, ग्रेडर कैलाश नई बिल्ली 110048)	IS:458-1971
42.	सी एम/एल-1266649 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	गौतम केबल इंडस्ट्रीज, 222, नांगली सक्कावती नजफगढ़ रोड, नई बिल्ली-110043	IS:1554 (भाग 1) -1976
43.	सी एम/एल-1266750 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	मंजीत इंडस्ट्रीज, 573/1, मेन रोड मंडोली, (नंदनगरी के नजदीक) शाहबरा बिल्ली-110093	IS:1341-1976
44.	सी एम/एल-1266851 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	अलंकार केबल, शालीमार इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बिल्ली 110033	IS:1554 (भाग 1) -1976
45.	सी एम/एल-1266952 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	शिकनी प्राटो प्रा. लि. स्ट्रीट सं. 9 प्लाट सं. 11 समयपुर-बाबली, नई बिल्ली-110042 (कार्यालय : बूसरी मंजिल स्तुति बिल्डिंग बैंक स्ट्रीट करोलबाग नई बिल्ली-110005)	IS:4246-1978
46.	सी एम/एल-1267045 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	सीटो इंजीनियर्स, 32वां मील जी टी रोड, कुंडली, सोनीपत (हरियाणा)	IS:4246-1978
47.	सी एम/एल-1267146 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	बी एल एल इंडस्ट्रीज, 5 डी/बी ई रेलवे रोड, एन आई टी/रुशीबाबा 121001 (हरियाणा)	IS:4246-1978
48.	सी एम/एल-1267247 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	कृषि केमिकल्स प्रो. बंगाल पेस्टीसाइड्स प्रा. लि. गांव एओरा कोना बनारस रोड, हावड़ा (प. ब.) कार्यालय : 10, कलाइय रो, कलकत्ता- 700001)	IS:1308-1974

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
49. सी एम/एल-1267348 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	वेस्टर्न इंडियन मशीनरी कं., 7 मावड़ी प्लाट, बिमको हाउस, राजकोट-360004	IS : 10001-1981	
50. सी एम/एल-1267449 1984-12-17	84-01-16	85-01-15	साहू सिलिडर्स एण्ड उद्योग प्रा. लि. प्लाट सं. डी-12 सिपकोट इंडस्ट्रियल कम्प्लेक्स, मन्नास (कार्यालय : गुम्भीडी पंडी, 1601201 बिगलेपुट जिला(त.ना)	IS : 3196-1974	
51. सी एम/एल-1267550 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	बंगलोर रेस्टोसाइड्स लि., 16वां स्लै, टुमकुर रोड, बंगलौर 560073 (कर्नाटक) कार्यालय : 33 साके रोड, फास बंगलौर-560052)	IS : 2865-1978	
52. सी एम/एल-1267651 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	सैंट एंड्रयू इन्डियन एप्लायड इंस्टीट्यूट (प्रा) लिमिटेड होरीयाधका उडपी तालुक (कर्नाटक) कार्यालय : माकुरि बीगिका, उडपी- 576101	IS : 4246-1978	
53. सी एम/एल-1267752 1984-03-01	84-01-01	84-12-31	ग्वालियर केबल्स एण्ड कंडक्टर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, ग्वालियर(म.प्र.)	IS : 398(भाग 2)- 1976	
54. सी एम/एल-1267853 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	ब मध्य प्रोटेस्ट एण्ड इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कार्पो. इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट बीना जिला सागर (म.प्र.) कार्यालय सीतरी मंजिल पंचानन, मालवीयनगर, सोपास	IS : 633-1975	
55. सी एम/एल-1267954 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	विलियम एंड विल्सन रॉटस 65 मैक्सी रोड, उज्जैन (म.प्र.) कार्यालय : 61, अमरसिंह मार्ग, उज्जैन (म.प्र.)	IS : 2932-1974	
56. सी एम/एल-1268047 1984-01-11	84-01-01	85-01-31	टी एन टी प्राइवेट मंवार बाया ग्रबू रोड, जिला सिरोही-307513	IS : 8806-1978	
57. सी एम/एल-1268148 1984-01-12	84-02-01	85-01-31	हिन्दुस्तान एलुमिनियम कार्पो. लि. डाकघर रेणुकोट, जिला मिर्जापुर- 231217	IS : 7092(भाग 2)- 1976	
58. सी एम/एल-1268249 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	राजस्थान सिलिडर्स एंड कंटेनर्स लि. एल पी-25 विश्वकर्मा इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया जयपुर (कार्यालय : ऋतुराज, एम आई रोड, जयपुर)	IS : 3296-1974	
59. सी एम/एल-1268350 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	यूनिलास इंडिया (प्रा.) लि. एक 129-130 सेक्टर-7 मोएडा गाजियाबाद (उ.प्र.) कार्यालय 504 साब्रेजी कम्प्लेक्स, डी एल एक सेक्टर ग्रेटर कैलाश 2, नई दिल्ली	IS : 4985-1980	

1	2	3	4	5	6
60. सी एम/एल-1268451 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	ए के जी इंडस्ट्रीज, 158-ए पिकनिक गार्डन रोड, कलकत्ता-700039 कार्यालय : 4/2 मिडिलटन स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700071	IS : 6595-1980	
61. सी एम/एल-1268552 1964-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	हिन्दू सिरमिक्स लिमिटेड 147 नीलगंज, रोड, बालबिड़िया कलकत्ता-700056 कार्यालय : स्मोकेन हाउस, 4 बी बी डी बाग, (पूर्व) कलकत्ता-700001	IS : 651-1980	
62. सी एम/एल-1268653 1983-11-30	84-02-01	85-01-31	यूनाइटेड फूड प्राइवेट लिमिटेड सं. 17 सेक्टर 1, परवान (हि. प्र.)	IS : 1011-1981	
63. सी एम/एल-1268754 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	रीवा इंजीनियरिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, एफ-25/1, ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फेज-2 नई दिल्ली-110020	IS : 3832-1971	
64. सी एम/एल-1268855 1984-01-13	84-02-01	85-01-31	ब्राइट इंजीनियरिंग कं. 25-ए, के. आर. पुरम रोड, गणपती पोस्ट कोयम्बटूर-641006	IS : 7538-1975	
65. सी एम/एल-1268956 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	सुर्वेशन इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, ए-246 बाले इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट रोड बी, ठाणे-400604 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 7402 (भाग 2) -1975	
66. सी एम/एल-1269049 1984-01-18	84-02-01	85-01-31	भारत पल्बराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा. लि. 1074, तिरुओट्टियुर हाई रोड, मद्रास-600019 (त. ना.)	IS : 9360-1980	
67. सी एम/एल-1269150 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	नवल केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज सी-34 जी आई डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट उधद-382415 (गुजरात) कार्यालय : कृष्णा संशन घो बाजार, अहमदाबाद-380003	IS : 3625-1971	
68. सी एम/एल-1269251 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	ग्राल इंडिया मेडिकल कार्पोरेशन बी/13, 14, 15 जी आई डी सी इस्टेट अहमदाबाद (कार्यालय : बी-15 लाखडवाला सोसायटी, नरनपुरा, चार रास्ता (अहमदाबाद))	IS : 8028-1976	
69. सी एम/एल-1269352 1984 01 19	84-02-01	85-01-31	सत्यम् फूड प्राइवेट लि-4 एम आई डी सी सुताथ खामगाव- 444803 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 1011-1981	
70. सी एम/एल 1269453 1964-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	भारत पल्बराइजिंग मिल्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, अंधेरी कुर्ला रोड, चकला अंधेरी बम्बई-400093 (कार्यालय : श्रीनिकेतन, 14, बबीन्ज रोड, बम्बई-400020)	IS : 8498-1977	

1	2	3	4	5	6
71. सी एम/एल-1269554 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	एप्रो केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज पुनमालेस मयड़ी रोड, कंडुवेट्टी मन्नास-600077 (त. ना.) कार्यालय प्लॉट नं. 4231 ब्लॉक टी-45 मन्नासगर, मन्नास-600040	IS : 4323-1980	
72. सी एम/एल-1269655 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	श्री अमरज्योति मिटिंग्स 61, पी एन रोड, तिरुपुर-638602 (त. ना.)	IS : 4964-1980	
73. सी एम/एल-1269756 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	आचार्य अवर्स 37/15 फोरशोर रोड 3/4 पीटो आर-साईडिंग, डाकवर्-साहिबपुर शालीमार, हावड़ा-2 (प. बंगाल) कार्यालय : 135 बी, आर बी बसुरोड, कोलिंग स्ट्रीट कलकत्ता-700001	IS : 9182 (भाग 3) 1979	
74. सी एम/एल-1269857 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	पी बी रबड़ प्राइवेट्स 36/एच/4 देवेन्द्र जन्म बे रोड, कलकत्ता-700015 (प. ब.)	IS : 3976-1975	
75. सी एम/एल-1269958 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	फूडकोर्स 30 बैनर्जी पारा रोड सारसुन, कलकत्ता-700061 (प. ब.)	IS : 5520-1969	
76. सी एम/एल-1270034 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	यूनिवर्सल पेंट्स अवर्स, 293, ईस्टमोहन नगर, अमृतसर (पंजाब)	IS : 3536-1966	
77. सी एम/एल-1270135 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	सुराना स्पोर्ट्स इंडस्ट्रीज बस्तीनाऊं, जालन्धर-144002 (पंजाब)	IS : 828-197	
78. सी एम/एल-1270236 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	नेशनल टेस्टोसाइड्स 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिबिशा-464001 (म. प्र.)	IS : 5662-1978	
79. सीएम/एल-1270337 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	बलवन्त अवर्स बस्तीनाऊं, जालन्धर (पंजाब)	IS : 417 (भाग 1) 1974	
80. सीएम/एल-1270438 1984-03-01	84-02-01	84-01-31	एस एन केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज बी-25 गधर्ममेंट इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, महरोली रोड, गुड़गांव-122001 (कार्यालय : जीडीए रोड, नं. 90 ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट (फेज 2) नई दिल्ली-110020)	IS : 562-1978	
81. सीएम/एल-1270539 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	उत्तर रसायन उद्योग लिमिटेड, 19-20, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया सिकन्दरानाद, जिला बुलन्दाशहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) (कार्यालय : 44, कम्युनिटी सेंटर, बसंत लोक बसंत विहार, नई दिल्ली-110057)	IS : 2567-1978	
82. सीएम/एल-1270640 1984-01-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	कमाण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज बैद्यवाड़ी गौडल, रोड, रेलवे कॉलिंग के नजदीक, राजकोट-360004	IS : 10001-1981	

2	3	4	5	6
83. सीएम/एल-1270741 1984-10-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	सुवर्तन प्लाइवुड इंडस्ट्रीज, एटी रोड, मारवेकिरता जिला डिब्रूगढ़ (कार्यालय : 4, फेयरली प्लेस, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 710-1976
84. सीएम/एल-1270842 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	ब नेशनल रोलिंग एण्ड स्टील रोपर्स लि., अम्बपुर, ग्यामनगर 24-परगना (पश्चिम बंगाल) (कार्यालय : निको हाउस, हेयर स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1)	IS : 1855-1977
85. सीएम/एल-1270943 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	हिन्दू आयरन फाउंड्री रेलवे, रोड, बटाला (पंजाब)	IS : 780-1980
86. सीएम/एल-1271036 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	नवयुग आर्टो एलायड इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लिमिटेड, बाई पास जोडी रोड, जालन्धर-144004	IS : 2494-1974
87. सीएम/एल-1271137 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	सुलेखराम बनारसीदास, स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, मंडी गोबिन्दगढ़ 147301 (पंजाब)	IS : 226-1975
88. सीएम/एल-1271238 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	एशियन इस्पात प्रा. लि. बी-24 मोलाग्रामी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, हैदराबाद-500040	IS : 1856-1977
89. सीएम/एल-1271339 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	यनिवर्सल केबल्स लिमिटेड पोस्टबाक्स 9, सतना (म.प्र.)	IS : 9857-1981
90. सीएम/एल-1271440 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	आशिताय केबल्स एंड कंडक्टरज प्रा. लि. , ई-43 ए रोड, नं. 1-बी विश्वकर्मा इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया जयपुर-302013	IS : 398 (भाग 1) 1976
91. सीएम/एल-1271541 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	एम एम कंपनी बी-30 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, कटक-753010	IS : 9301-1982
92. सी एम/एल-1271642 1984-01-19	82-02-01	85-01-31	फ़ाउण्ड्री, 30 बंनर्जी पारा रोड, सारसून कलकत्ता-700061 (प.बं.)	IS : 4512-1978
93. सीएम/एल-1271743 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	साइन्ट्रीवैट इंडस्ट्रीज, जी.टी. रोड, छेहरदा, अमृतसर-143105 (पंजाब)	IS : 427-1965
94. सीएम/एल-1271844 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	आपेक इंडिया प्रा. लि. 27, कोप्रावरेटिव इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बालनगर एक्सटेंशन हैदराबाद-500037 (अ.प्र.)	IS : 1551-1976
95. सीएम/एल-1271945 1984-01-21	54-02-01	85-01-31	सहस्रधाया इंडस्ट्रीज, 14/2 मील बिल्ली गुड़गांव रोड, गांव डुडाहेड़ा, जिला गुड़गांव	IS : 4654-1974
96. सीएम/एल-1272038 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	हबीसाइडस इंडिया (प्रा.) लि., 12 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, मोडबाड़ा जयपुर-302012, राजस्थान	IS : 9362-1980
97. सीएम/एल-1272139 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	बिवाकर इंजीनियर्स लि. बी.-65/1 बजीरपुर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बिल्ली-110052	IS : 7138-1973

1	2	3	4	5	6
98. सीएम/एल-1272240 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	सत्य शर्जन इंडस्ट्रीज (कलिंग) प्रा. लि., चांदका न्यूक्लीयर इंडस्ट्रियल कम्प्लेक्स गांधी पटिया, भुवनेश्वर (कार्यालय : 85 ए, शाहीबनगर, भुवनेश्वर-751007)	IS : 3196-1982	
99. सीएम/एल-12/2341 1984-01-28	84-02-01	85-01-31	शिवालिक एप्रो केनिकल्स बी-59, फेज 2, एसएएस नगर (मोहाली) जिला रोपड़ (पंजाब) (कार्यालय: नीलम सिनेमा, सेक्टर-17 चंडीगढ़)	IS : 6177-1981	
100. सीएम/एल-1272442 1984-01-28	84-02-01	85-01-31	बी डी स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स 79, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, चंडीगढ़	IS : 1786-1979	
101. सीएम/एल-1272543 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	महावीर पीवीसी पाइप्स प्रा. लि. 5-6 मील, भिवानी, बावरी रोड, गांधी हलुवास, जिला भिवानी (हरियाणा)	IS : 4985-1981	
102. सीएम/एल-1272644 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-01-15	विरज इलेक्ट्रिकल्स (इंडिया) लि., 29, मल्कागंज रोड, दिल्ली-110007	IS : 2082-1978	
103. सीएम/एल-1272745 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	विश्वेश्वरैया प्रायरन एंड स्टील लि., भद्रावती-577301 जिला कर्नाटक	IS : 7887-1975	
104. सीएम/एल-1272846 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	कर्नाटक इंडस्ट्रियल (प्रा.) लि., माथुर जिला गुलबर्गा, कर्नाटक-565267 ^A (कार्यालय : 27/1 मेन रोड, जयमहल एक्सटेंस, बंगलौर)	IS : 269-1976	
105. सीएम/एल-1272947 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	लोहाक स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, 12वां मील पुराना मद्रास रोड, एस के एंड एस खोमासान्द्र के निकट, बंगलौर-560049 (कार्यालय : 28 महात्मा गांधी रोड, पांचथी मंजिल, सेंटेंनरी बिल्डिंग बंगलौर-560001)	IS : 7887-1975	
106. सीएम/एल-1273040 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	श्री नित्यानंद स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, कोन्नगलवाडी, नेराल (महाराष्ट्र राज्य) कार्यालय : बारुखामा, सीसरी लेन, मसगांव, बम्बई	IS : 1786-1979-	
107. सीएम/एल-1273141 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-01-15	राम पुर्णा एंटरप्राइजेज राम पुर्णागंजन मडुरावाड़ा-530019 जिला विशाखापटनम कार्यालय: 43, 18, 26 बैकटा मुत्तनगर विशाखापटनम-530016)	IS : 208-1979	
108. सीएम/एल-1273242 1984-01-28	82-02-16	85-02-15	राज लक्ष्मी एंटरप्राइजेज 14-वी एनोर हाई रोड, मद्रास-600019	IS : 1786-1979	

1	2	3	4	5	6
109.	सीएम/एल-1273343 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	महेन्द्र इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, 6/433 पीतम पालायम रोड, पुलिया कुसम, कोयम्बटूर-641018	IS : 659-1980
110.	सीएम/एल-1273444 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	म.प्र. केबल्ज (प्रा.) लि., 29, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, रामपुर	IS : 694-1977
111.	सीएम/एल-1273545 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	ग्रार जी सीमेंट पावप फैक्टरी, बाईवास शोतला रोड, ट्रांसपोर्ट नगर के नजदीक डाकघर बयालबाग, आगरा-282005 आगरा-281005	IS : 458-1971
112.	सीएम/एल-1273646 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	त्रिवेणी मेटल ट्यूब्स लि., कानपुर-सखनऊ रोड, उन्नाव (कार्यालय : 24/56 रिसन रोड, कानपुर)	IS : 1161-1979
113.	सीएम/एल-1273747 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	रतन हरी रोलिंग मिश्र लि., मगरबाड़ा, उन्नाव (उ.प्र.), (कार्यालय: सोमानी भवन, 51/27 नयागंज, कानपुर)	IS : 226-1975

[सं सीएमजी 13 : 11]

S.O. 3794.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1937/94, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that one hundred and hundred licences, particulars of which are given in the following schedule, have been granted during the month of the January 1984 authorizing the licensees to use the Standard Marks :

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Licence No. (CM/L—)	Period of validity From	To	Name and address of the Licensee	Article/Process covered by the Licences and the Relevant IS : Designation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	CM/L-1262540 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	Kona International (P) Ltd., G-141, Phase VII, Indl. Area, Mohali (Punjab).	IS : 1592—1980
2.	CM/L-1262641 1984-03-01	84-01-16	84-01-15	Asian Industries, 12/146-B Behind Auto-Sales Nunhai, Agra-282006. (Office : 81, North Vijay Nagar Colony, Agra-282004).	IS : 6595—1980
3.	CM/L-1262742 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	Karnataka Forest Plantations Corpn. Limited, KSFC Limited, Sullia Division, Sullia-574239. (Office : 15/94 Planters Lane, Mangalore-575003).	IS : 5430—1981
4.	CM/L-1262843 1984-12-17	84-01-16	85-01-15	Shaktiwan Manufacturers, 46-E, Bhaktinagar Indl. Estate, Rajkot-360002.	IS : 10001—1981
5.	CM/L-1262944 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	Western Hardware Industries, 13 Industrial Estate, Jammu-180010.	IS : 398 (Part-ID)—1976
6.	CM/L-1263037 1984-01-02	84-01-16	85-01-15	Indian Spun Pipe Co. Village Parol, Near Mullanpur, Distt. Ropar (Punjab)	IS : 458—1971
7.	CM/L-1263138 1984-03-01	84-01-16	84-01-15	Mauria Udyog Limited, Sohna Road, (Near Gouchi Octroi Post) Sector 25, Faridabad. (Office : B-231, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase I, New Delhi-110020).	IS : 3196—1974

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
8. CM/L-1263239 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	A.K. Corporation Limited, Malkapuram, Visakhapatnam-530011.	IS : 1786—1979	
9. CM/L-1263340 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	D & H Secheron Electrodes Pvt. Ltd., 44-46, Industrial Estate, Kila Maidan Indore-45006 (MP).	IS : 814 (Part II)—1974	
10. CM/L-1263441 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Finolux Plastics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 10, Block 'C' Pimpri Chinchwad Indl. Area, Chinchwad, Pune-411019.	IS : 7834 (Part VI)—1975	
11. CM/L-1263542 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Ekta Engineers, E-140, Focal Point, Dhandari Kalan, Ludhiana.	IS : 778—1971	
12. CM/L-126343 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Swastik Light House, 26/27, Ramgopal Industrial Estate, R.P. Road, Mulund (W), Bombay-400080. (Office : 39/13 Abdul Rehman Street, 2nd Floor, Near Pydhone, Bombay-400003).	IS : 4308—1967	
13. CM/L-1263744 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Elektratek Industries, 18, Vanivilas Road, Basavangudi.	IS : 4159—1976	
14. CM/L-1263845 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Spun Pipe Plant (A unit of IDC of Orissa Limited) Matkamboda, Barbil, Distt. Keonjhar-768036 (Orissa).	IS : 1536—1976	
15. CM/L-1263946 1984-01-03	84-01-16	84-01-15	Modern Laminators, C-4, Industrial Area, Gorakhpur-273004.	IS : 4989—1981	
16. CM/L-1264039 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Rasi Knitters, 2/7, Kongunagar Main Road, Tirupur-638607 (TN).	IS : 4964—1980	
17. CM/L-1264140 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Bharat Pesticides Manufacturing Company, E-17 DSIDC, Industrial Complex, Rohtak Road, Nangli, Delhi-110014.	IS : 1308—1974	
18. CM/L-1264241 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	J.G. Vacuum Flasks Limited, Chinchwad, Pune-411019 (Maharashtra) (Office : 2nd Floor, co-op Insurance Building, Sir P.M. Road, Bombay-400001).	IS : 7708—1975	
19. CM/L-1264342 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Jana Jivan Foods (P) Limited, Bibinagar, Bhangir Taluque, Nalgonda Distt. (AP).	IS : 1485—1976	
20. CM/L-1264443 1984-01-03	83-01-16	85-01-15	J.G. Vacuum Flasks Limited, Chinchwad, Pune-411019 (Maharashtra) (Office : 2nd Floor Co-operative Insurance Building, Sir P. M. Road, Bombay-400001).	IS : 3702—1975	
21. CM/L-1264544 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Royal Mechanical Works, G.T. Road, Malout (Punjab).	IS : 9020—1979	
22. CM/L-1264645 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	J.K. Jute Mills Co. Limited, Kalpi Road, Fazal Ganj, Kanpur (UP).	IS : 2580—1982	
23. CM/L-1264746 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Binny Limited, Engineering Division, Meanambakkam, Madras-600 051 (TN) (Office - 65 Armenian Street, Madras-600001).	IS : 9555—1980	
24. CM/L-1264847 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Cipla Electrical Industries, WZ-101 Village Khyala, New Delhi-110 018.	IS : 2312—1967	
25. CM/L-1264948 1984-01-03	84-01-16	85-01-15	Southern Enterprises (Gas appliances) No. 10 Third Street (East) R.E. Nagar, Porur, Madras-602104 (TN).	IS : 4246—1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
26. CM/L-1265041 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Rama Steel Tube Pvt Ltd., B-21, Site No. 4, Industrial Area, Sahibabad (U.P.). (Office : 6 Kishan Market, (2nd Floor) 2897, Sirkiwala, Hauz Qazi, Delhi-110 006).	IS : 1239 (Part I)—1979	
27. CM/L-1265142 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Swan Enterprises, D-166, Flatted Factories Complex, Near Okhla Industrial Estate, Okhla, New Delhi-110 020	IS : 4246—1978	
28. CM/L-1265243 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Hydro Valves, H. No. 125, Village Pitampura, Delhi-110 034.	IS : 4246—1978	
29. CM/L-1265344 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	Gemco Pressings India, A-8/1 Jhilmil, Tahirpur Industrial Area, Shahdara, Delhi-110 032. (Office : 5/69 Bara Bazar, Shahdara, Delhi-110 032).	IS : 4246—1978	
30. CM/L-1265445 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Lacmi Engineering Works, Opp. Bavri Kunbharvada, Idgah Road, Baroda-390 004 (Gujarat).	IS : 4246—1978	
31. CM/L-1265546 1984-01-05	84-01-16	85-01-15	Associated Cement Cos. Ltd., Mancherial Cement Works, P.O. Mancherial Cement Works- 504209 Mancherial (S.C. Raly.) Distt. Adilabad (A.P.).	IS : 1489—1976	
32. CM/L-1265647 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Orvotex, 78-B(1) Ramaiah Colony Main Road, Tinepur-638602 (TN).	IS : 4964—1980	
33. CM/L-1265748 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	Sri Lakshmi Textiles, 5(1) P.N. Road, Tirupur-638602 (TN).	IS : 4964—1980	
34. CM/L-1263849 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	'A' One Knitting Co., 14, SIDCO Industrial Estate, Harvey Road, Tirupur-638602 (TN).	IS : 4964—1980	
35. CM/L-1265950 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Sri Lakshmi Paints and Varnish Works, B-3 Industrial Estate, Guntur-522 002 (Andhra Pradesh). (Office : Patnam Bazar, Guntur-522003).	IS : 123—1962	
36. CM/L-1265043 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Special Steel Limited, F-8, Tarapur Industrial Area, Distt. Thane-401 506 (Maharashtra).	IS : 1786—1979	
37. CM/L-1265144 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	J.K. Iron & Steel Co. Limited, Kalpi Road, Fazal Ganj, Kanpur. (Office : Kamla Tower, Kanpur).	IS : 1786—1979	
38. CM/L-1265245 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	Sethi Steel Corporation 571-A, Bhogtonwali Gali Nangloi Village, New Delhi. (Office : Phatak Banswala, Bazar Sita Ram, Delhi-110 033).	IS : 1341—1981	
39. CM/L-1265346 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Agro Chemicals, F-214, 215 Road No. 10, VKI Area, Jaipur-302013. (Office : D-5 Mangal Bhavan, Chandpole Grain Market, Jaipur).	IS : 8960—1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)
40. CM/L-1266447 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Arro Chemicals, F-1214, 215 Road No. 10, VKI Area, Jaipur-302013. (Office : D-5 Mangal Bhavan, Chandpole Grain Market, Jaipur).	IS : 2355-1973	
41. CM/L-1266548 1984-03-01	84-01-16	85-01-15	Ashv Pipes, 11th KM Gurgaon Jaipur Road, Village Khirkh Daula, Distt Gurgaon, (Office : 147, Greater Kailash-I, New Delhi-110048).	IS : 133-1971	
42. CM/L-1266549 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Gautam Cable Industries, 221 Naruli Sakrawati, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-110043	IS : 1554(Part I)-1976	
43. CM/L-1266550 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Manjit Industries, 573/1, Main Road, Mandoli (Near Nand Nagari), Shahdara, Delhi-110093	IS : 1341-1976	
44. CM/L-1266351 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Alankar Cable, Shalimar Industrial Area, Delhi-110033.	IS : 1554(Part-I)-1976	
45. CM/L-1266952 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Shivani Auto P. Ltd., Street No. 9 Plot No. 11, Samaspur Badli, New Delhi-110042. (Office : 2nd Floor, Statue Building, Bank Street, Karol Bath, New Delhi-110005).	IS : 4246-1978	
46. CM/L-1267045 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Seato Engineers, 32 K. M. G. T. Road, Kundli, Sonapat (Haryana).	IS : 4246-1978	
47. CM/L-1267146 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	BSF Industries, 5 D/BE, Railway Road, NIT Faridabad-121001 (Haryana).	IS : 4246-1978	
48. CM/L-1267247 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	Krishi Chemicals, Prop. Bengal Pesticides Pvt. Ltd., Village Ekshora, Kona, Benaras Road, Howrah (WB). (Office : 10 Olive Row, Calcutta-700011).	IS : 1308-1974	
49. CM/L-1267348 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	Western Indian Machinery Company, 7 Mavdi Plot 'WIMCO HOUSE' Rajkot-360004.	IS : 10001-1931	
50. CM/L-1268449 1984-12-17	84-01-16	85-01-15	Sahu Cylinders and Udyog Pvt Ltd, Plot No. D-12, SIPCOT Industrial Complex, Madras. (Office : Gurnaldipundi-1601201, Chingleput Distt. Tamil Nadu).	IS : 3106-1974	
51. CM/L-1267550 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	Bangalore Pesticides Limited, 16th KM, Tumkur Road, Bangalore-560073 (Karnataka). (Office : 33 Barkay Road, Cross, Bangalore-550052).	IS : 2355-1973	
52. CM/L-1267651 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	Gas and Electrical Appliances Industries (P) Limited, Hariadkha, Udupi, Taluk (Karnataka). (Office : Miruthi Veethika, Udupi-575101).	IS : 4246-1978	
53. CM/L-1267752 1984-03-01	84-01-01	84-12-31	Gwalior Cables & Conductors, Industrial Area, Gwalior (MP).	IS : 393(Part II)-1976	
54. CM/L-1267853 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	The Malviya Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corpn, Industrial Estate, Bina Distt. Sagar (MP). (Office : 3rd Floor, "Panchanan", Malviya Nagar, Bhopal).	IS : 633-1975	
55. CM/L-1267954 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	William & Wilson Paints, 65 Maxi Road, Ujjain (MP). (office : 61 Amarsingh Marg, Ujjain (MP).	IS : 2332-1974	
56. CM/L-1268047 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	Testee Products, Mandar, Via Abu Road, Distt. Sirahi-307513.	IS : 8305-1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
57. CM/L-1268148 1984-01-12	84-02-01	85-01-31	Hindustan Aluminium Corpn. Ltd, P. O. Renukat, Distt : Mirzapur-231217	IS : 7092 (Part-II)—1976	
58. CM/L-1268249 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	Rajasthan Cylinders & Containers Limited, 6P-825 Vishwakarma Industrial Area, Jaipur (Office : Rituraj, M. I. Road, Jaipur)	IS : 3196—1974	
59. CM/L-1268350 1984-01-11	84-01-16	85-01-15	Uniphus India (P) Limited, F-129-130, Sector VIII, NOIDA, Ghaziabad (UP) (Office : 504, Savitri Complex, DLF Centre Greater Kailash II, New Delhi)	IS : 4935—1980	
60. CM/L-1268451 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	A.K.G. Industries, 153-A, Picnic Garden Road, Calcutta-700039 (Off : 4/2 Middle Tone Street, Calcutta-700071)	IS : 6555—1980	
61. CM/L-1268552 1984-01-11	84-02-01	85-01-31	Hind Ceramics Limited, 147 Nilgunj Road, Belghoria, Calcutta-700056 (Office : Stephen House, 4, B.B.D. Bag (East) Calcutta-700001)	IS : 651—1980	
62. CM/L-1268653 1983-11-30	84-02-01	85-01-31	United Food Products, Plot No 17, Sector 1, Parwanoo (HP)	IS : 1011—1981	
63. CM/L-1268754 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Reva Engineering Industries, F-25/1, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase II, New Delhi-110020	IS : 3332—1971	
64. CM/L-1268855 1984-01-13	84-02-01	85-01-31	Bright Engineering Company, 25-A, K. R. Param Road, Ganapathy Post, Coimbatore-641006	IS : 7533—1975	
65. CM/L-1268956 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Sudarshan Electrical Industries Private Limited, A-246 Wagla Industrial Estate Road, B, Thane-400604 (Maharashtra)	IS : 7402 (Part II)—1975	
66. CM/L-1269049 1984-01-18	84-02-01	85-01-31	Bharat Pulverising Mills Private Limited, 1074 Thiruvottiyur, High Road, Madras-600019 (TN)	IS : 9360—1980	
67. CM/L-1269150 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Naval Chemical Industries, C-34 GIDC Industrial Estate, Odhav-382415 (Gujarat) (Office : Krishna Mansion, Ghee Bazar, Ahmedabad-380003)	IS : 3625—1971	
68. CM/L-1269251 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	All India Medical Corporation, B/13, 14, 15 GIDC Industrial Estate, Ahmedabad (Office : B/15 Lokhandwala Society, Naranpura, Char Rasta, Ahmedabad)	IS : 8028—1976	
69. CM/L-1269352 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Satyam Food Products, B-4, MIDC Sutala Khamgaom-444303 (Maharashtra)	IS : 1011—1981	
70. CM/L-1269453 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Bharat Pulverising Mills Private Limited, Andheri Kurla Road, Chakala, Andheri, Bombay-400093 (Office : 'Shriniketan' 14 Queens Road, Bombay-400020)	IS : 8478—1977	
71. CM/L-1269554 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Agro Chemical Industries, Poonamalles-Avadi Road, Kaduvotty, Madras-600077 (TN) (Office : Plot No. 4231, Block T-45 Annanagar, Madras-600040)	IS : 4323—1980	
72. CM/L-1269655 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Sri Amarjothi Knittings, 61, P. N. Road, Tirupur-638602 (TN)	IS : 4951—1980	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
73. CM/L-126756 1984-01-19	85-02-01	85-01-31	Acharya Brothers, 37/15, Foreshore Road, 3/4 P.T.R. Siding P.O. Shibpur, Shalimar, Howrah-2 (West Bengal) (Office : 135 B.R.B. Basu Road (Canning Street), Calcutta-700001)	IS : 9182 (Part III) 1979	
74. CM/L-1267857 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	P. B. Rubber Products, 36/H/4 Dabendra Chandra Dey Road, Calcutta-700015 (West Bengal)	IS : 3976—1975	
75. CM/L-1269958 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Footform, 30, Banerji Para Road, Sarsuna, Calcutta-700061 (West Bengal)	IS : 5520—1969	
76. CM/L-1270034 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Universal Paints Works, 293 East Mohan Nagar, Amritsar (Punjab)	IS : 3536—1966	
77. CM/L-1270135 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Khurana Sports Industries, Basti Nau, Jalandhar-144002 (Punjab)	IS : 828—1979	
78. CM/L-1270236 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	National Pesticides 5-Industrial Estate, Vidisha-464001 (MP)	IS : 562—1978	
79. CM/L-1270337 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Balwant Brothers, Basti Nau, Jalandhar (Punjab)	IS : 417(Part-I)—1974	
80. CM/L-1270438 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	S.N. Chemical Industries, B-25, Govt. Industrial Estate, Mahrauli Road, Gurgaon-122 001 (Office : DDA, Shed No. 90, Okhla Industrial Estate (Phase II) New Delhi-110020)	IS : 562—1978	
81. CM/L-1270539 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Uttra Rasayan Udyog Limited, 19-20, Industrial Area, Sikandarabad, Distt. Bulandshahr (UP) (Office : 44 Community Centre, Basant Lok, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110 057)	IS : 2567—1978	
82. CM/L-1270640 1984-01-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	Command Industries, Vaidwadi Gondal Road, Near Rly. Crossing, Rajkot-360004	IS : 10001—1981	
83. CM/L-1270741 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Sudarshan Plywood Industries, A.T. Road, Margherita, Distt. Dibrugarh (Office : 4 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-700 001)	IS : 710—1976	
84. CM/L-1270842 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	The National Rolling and Steel Ropes Limited, Athpur, Shyam Nagar, 24 Parganas (WB) (Office : NICCO House, Hair Street, Calcutta-I)	IS : 1855—1977	
85. CM/L-1270913 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Hard Iron Foundry, Railway Road, Batala (Punjab)	IS : 780—1980	
86. CM/L-1271036 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Navyug Auto and Allied Industries (P) Limited, Bye Pass G.T. Road, Jalandhar-144004	IS : 2494—1974	
87. CM/L-1271137 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Sulekh Ram Banarsi Dass Steel Rolling Mills, Mandi Gobindgarh-147301 (Punjab)	IS : 226—1975	
88. CM/L-1271238 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Asian Ispat Pvt. Limited, B-24, Moula-Ali Industrial Estate, Hyderabad-500040	IS : 1856—1977	
89. CM/L-1271339 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Universal Cables Limited, Post Box No. 9, Satna (MP)	IS : 9857—1981	

1	2	3	4	5	6
90. CM/L-1271440 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Adinath Cables & Conductors Pvt Limited, E-43 A, Road No. 1-B Vishwakarma Industrial Area, Jaipur-302013	IS : 398 (Part I)—1976	
91. CM/L-1271541 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	M.M. & Company, B-30, Industrial Estate Cuttack-753010	IS : 9301—1982	
92. CM/L-1271642 1984-01-19	84-02-01	85-01-31	Footform, 30, Banerji Para Road, Sarsuna, Calcutta-700061 (West Bengal)	IS : 4512—1978	
93. CM/L-1271743 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	Shastri Paint Industries, G.T. Road, Chhcharta, Amritsar-143105 (Punjab)	IS : 427—1965	
94. CM/L-1271844 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	Opec India Pvt Limited 27 Co-operative Industrial, Estate, Balanagar Extension Hyderabad-500037 (Andhra Pradesh)	IS : 1551—1976	
95. CM/L-1271945 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	Sahasrathara Industries, 14/2 Milestone, Delhi-Gurgaon Road, Village Dundahera, District Gurgaon	IS : 4654—1974	
96. CM/L-1272038 1984-01-21	84-02-01	85-01-31	Herbicides India (Pvt.) Ltd. 12 Industrial Area, Jhotwara, Jaipur-302012 (Rajasthan)	IS : 9362—1980	
97. CM/L-1272139 1984-12-17	84-02-01	85-01-31	Diwakar Engineers Limited, B-65/1, Wazirpur Industrial Area, Delhi-110052	IS : 7138—1973	
98. CM/L-1272240 1984-03-01	84-02-01	85-01-31	Subarban Industries (Kalinga) Private Limited, Chandaka Nucleus Industrial Complex, Village—Patia Bhubaneswar (Office : 85A, Sahid Nagar, Bhubaneswar-751007)	IS : 3196—1982	
99. CM/L-1272341 1984-01-28	84-02-01	85-01-31	Shivalik Agro Chemicals, B-57, Phase II, SAS Nagar, (Mohali) Distt Ropar (Punjab) (Office : Neelam Cinema, Sector 17, Chandigarh)	IS : 6177—1981	
100. CM/L-1272442 1984-01-28	84-02-01	85-01-31	Bec Dee Steel Rolling Mills, 79, Industrial Area, Chandigarh	IS : 1786—1979	
101. CM/L-1272543 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Mahavir PVC Pipes Private Limited, 5.6 Km Bhiwani Dadri Road, Village Haluwas Distt Bhiwani (Haryana)	IS : 4985—1981	
102. CM/L-1272644 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Ditz Electricals (India) Limited, 29, Malka Ganj Road, Delhi-110007	IS : 2082—1978	
103. CM/L-1272745 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	Visvesveraya Iron and Steel Limited, Bahadravati-577301 Distt. Karnataka	IS : 7887—1975	
104. CM/L-1272846 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Karnataka Infra Structure (Private) Limited, Marthur, Gulbarga District, Karnataka-565267 (Office : 27/1 Main Road, Jayamahal Extension, Bangalore)	IS : 269—1976	
105. CM/L-1272947 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Loharu Steel Industries, 12th Mile, Old Madras Road, Opp. S.K. & F. Chemasandra, Bangalore-560049 (Office : 28 Mahatma Gandhi Road, 5th floor, Centenary Building, Bangalore-560001)	IS : 7887—1975	

1	2	3	4	5	6
106. CM/L-1273040 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	Shree Nityanand Steel Rolling Mills, Kotwalwadi, Neral (Maharashtra State) (Office : Darukhane, 3rd Lane, Mazagam, Bombay).	IS : 1786—1979	
107. CM/L-1273141 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Rama Durga Enterprises, Rama Durga Gardens, Maduravada-530019 (Visakhapatnam District) (Office : 43-18-26, Venkatarajunagar, Visakhapatnam-530016)	IS : 208—1979	
108. CM/L-1273242 1984-01-28	84-02-16	85-02-15	Raj Lexmi Enterprise, 14-B, Ennore High Road, Madras-600019	IS : 1786—1979	
109. CM/L-1273343 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	M. hendra Engineering Works, 6/433, P.N. Palayam Road, Puliyakulam, Coimbatore-641018	IS : 6595—1980	
110. CM/L-1273444 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	M.P. Cables (P) Limited, 29, Industrial Area, Raipur	IS : 694—1977	
111. CM/L-1273545 1984-01-28	82-02-16	85-02-15	R.D. Cement Pipe Factory Bye Pass, Shitla Road, Near Transport Nagar, P.O. Dayal Bagh, Agra-282005	IS : 458—1971	
112. CM/L-1273646 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	Triveni Metal Tubes, Ltd., Kanpur-Lucknow Road, Unnao (Office : 24/56 Birhana Road, Kanpur)	IS : 1161—1979	
113. CM/L-1273747 1984-03-01	84-02-16	85-02-15	Ratan Hari Rolling Mills Ltd., Magarwara, Unnao (UP) (Office : Somani Bhawan, 51/27, Naya Ganj, Kanpur)	IS : 226—1975	

[No. CMD/13 : 11]

नई दिल्ली, 17 अक्टूबर, 1986

क्रा. अा. 3795:—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन म्हर) विनियम 1955 के नियम 3 के उपविनियम 2 तथा विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (2) और (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के ब्योरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे तिथि 1983-12-31 को निर्धारित किए गए हैं:—

अनुसूची

क्र. सं. निर्धारित भारतीय मानकों की पद संख्या और शर्षक	तए भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक या मानकों, यदि कोई है, कि पद संख्या और शर्षक	अन्य विवरण
1	2	3
1. IS: 255—1982 सोडियम सल्फेट, निर्जलीय (तकनीकी ग्रेड) की विशिष्टि: (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 255—1967 सोडियम सल्फेट, निर्जलीय की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	1982-12-31 को स्थापित
2. IS: 524—1983 फिनिश देने का, बाहरी संश्लिष्ट वायु द्वारा शुष्क करने के वाणिश की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 524—1968, फिनिश देने का, बाहरी संश्लिष्ट वाणिश की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	—

1	2	3	4
3.	IS*:612—1983 भुने का कार्बोनी चूर्ण की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:612—1971 भुने कार्बोनी चूर्ण की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	*भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणन मूहर योजना हेतु IS:612—1983 तिथि 1984-08-01 से लागू होगी।
4.	IS:732(भाग 2)—1983 बिजली के तारों के संस्थापन की रीति संहिता भाग 2 अभिकल्प एवं निर्माण (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:732—1963 के तारों के संस्थापन की रीति संहिता (650 बाल्ट्स से अधिक नहीं के बाल्टेज तंत्र) (पुनरीक्षित)	—
5.	IS:1017—1983 साम्भर चर्म की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:1017—1966 साम्भर चर्म की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	—
6.	IS:1200(भाग 24)—1983 भवन एवं सिविल इंजीनियरी कार्यों की मापन पद्धति, भाग 24 कूप नीच (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:1200(भाग 24)—1971 भवन एवं सिविल इंजीनियरी कार्यों की मापन पद्धति, भाग 24 कूप नीच (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—
7.	IS:1424—1983 सूटी किरमिच की विशिष्टि (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:1424—1977 सूटी किरमिच की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—
8.	IS:2165 (भाग 2)—1983 रोधन समन्वयन भाग 2 पेज से पेज रोधन समन्वयन सिद्धान्त एवं नियम	IS:1424—	—
9.	IS:2167—1983 बोतल शीतक की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:2167—1972 बोतल शीतक की विशिष्टि	—
10.	IS:3374—1983 वायुयान के नियंत्रण के लिए कार्यान्वित इस्पात के तार की रस्सियां (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:3374—1965 वायुयान के नियंत्रण की कार्यान्वित कलईदार इस्पात के तार की रस्सियां	—
11.	IS:3400(भाग 13)—1983 बल्कनी-कृत रबड़ की परीक्षण पद्धतियां (भाग 13 तनन सेट) (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:3400(भाग 13):—1972 बल्कनी-कृत रबड़ के परीक्षण की पद्धतियां भाग 13 तनन सेट	—
12.	IS:3407(भाग 2)—1983 उन्नत तापमानों पर इस्पात की विसर्पण जांच पद्धति भाग 2 तनाव विसर्पण प्रतिबल विचार परीक्षण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:3407—1965 उन्नत तापमानों पर इस्पात की बाधित विसर्पण परीक्षण पद्धति (भार अवरोध तापमान)	—
13.	IS:3824 (भाग 4)—1983 बेलन धारक के गतिशील भार वर्ग मूल्यांकन की पद्धति भाग 4 नोद बेलन धारक (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:3824 (भाग 4)—1966 बेलन धारक के गतिशील भार वर्ग के मूल्यांकन की पद्धति भाग 4 नोद बेलन धारक	—
14.	IS:4007 (भाग 2/खण्ड 3)—1983 विद्युत उपकरणों के सिरों की विशिष्टि भाग 2 सिरों की विस्तृत विशिष्टि खण्ड 3 रोधित विमोहित पेच टोपी वाले आरोधित सिरों, टी एस सी 3 टाईप	—	—

1	2	3	5
15.	IS:4570 (भाग 2)—1983 स्फटिक एकक धारकों की विशिष्टि भाग 2 धातु का टांका लगाने की मुहर, दोषियों वाले स्फटिक एकक धारक टाईप एए एवं बीबी	—	
16.	IS:5786 (भाग 8)—1982 अल्प शक्ति के सामान्य कार्यों के लिए स्थित प्रतिरोधकों की विशिष्टि भाग 8 प्रति- रोधक टाईप एकप्रारएलपी 7 (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:5786 (भाग 8)—1976 अल्प शक्ति के सामान्य कार्यों के स्थिर प्रतिरोधकों की विशिष्टि भाग 8 प्रति- रोधक टाईप एक प्रार 7	—
17.	IS:5868—1983 चमड़े नमूने की पद्धति (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:5868—1969 चमड़े नमूने की पद्धति	—
18.	IS:6198—1983 रुस्तवानी तानदार एवं फट्टेदार इमारती लकड़ी के दरवाजे के कालों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:6198—1971 रुस्तवानी तानदार एवं फट्टेदार इमारती लकड़ी के दरवाजों के कालों की विशिष्टि	—
19.	IS:8507—(भाग 4/खण्ड 1)—1983 ठोस विद्युत अपघट्य वाले स्थिर रोधित अथवा मुद्रित टेन्टलम संघारित की विशिष्टि भाग 4 टाईप एक सी एस टी 3 खण्ड 1 ध्रुवीय	—	—
20.	IS:8967 (भाग 2)—1983 खेत की नाली की मिट्टी की टाइलें भाग 2 कालर जोड़ वाली छिद्रित टाइलें		
21.	IS:9859 (भाग 3)—1983 बाहरी विद्युत लाइन वाहक उपकरणों के संस्था- पन एवं रख रखाव की रीति संहिता, भाग 3 संयोजक संघारित / संघारित बोल्टेज परिवर्तक	—	—
22.	IS:10236 (भाग 7)—1983 प्रकाशिक यंत्रों हेतु मूलभूत जलवायु संबंधी एवं स्थापित परीक्षणों की विशिष्टि भाग 7 माउल्ट विकास जांच	—	—
23.	IS:10242(भाग 7/खण्ड 2)—1983 समुद्री जहाजों में विद्युत संस्थापन की विशिष्टि भाग 2 अभिकल्प तंत्र, खण्ड 2 सुरक्षा		
24.	IS:10242 (भाग 3/खण्ड 1)—1983 समुद्री जहाजों में विद्युत संस्थापन, भाग 3 उपस्कर, खण्ड 1 जलित एवं मोटरें	—	—

1	2	3	4
25.	IS:10519—1983 हेल्फ अगवर्षी वृत्तकार खण्ड युक्त बागिया	—	—
26.	IS. 10593—1983 तेन युक्त कार्यरत विद्युत उपकरणों में गैस के विश्लेषण के मूल्य का को विधि	—	—
27.	IS: 10618—1983 विजती की गाह्राई मशॉन हेतु सञ्चालक सूचनाओं का चित्रमय प्रदर्शन	—	—
28.	IS. 10619—1983 पके, मालेदार मिठानयुक्त काजूओं के विशिष्ट	—	—
29.	IS. 10621—1983 जनेबे मिश्रण विशिष्ट	—	—
30.	IS. 10629—1983 कतारों मिश्र एंड जट में एंड कब के अवशेषों के निर्धारण को पद्धतियाँ	—	—
31.	IS. 10630—1983 खाद्यानों में मियाईल पैराथियान के अवशेषों के निर्धारण का विधियाँ	—	—
32.	IS : 10636 (भाग 1)—1983 घात्विक पदार्थ के अवशेषों घिसाई गुणधर्म की मापन विधियाँ, भाग 1 गोल रुखानी अपघर्षक प्रति- रोध की परीक्षण विधि (दन्तुल दलित जांच)	—	—
33.	IS : 10636 (भाग 2)—1983 घात्विक पदार्थ के अवशेषों घिसाई गुणधर्म की मापन विधियाँ, भाग 2 उच्च प्रतिबल अपघर्षक की परीक्षण विधि	—	—
34.	IS: 10636 (भाग 3)—1983 घात्विक पदार्थ के अवशेषों घिसाई गुणधर्म की मापन विधियाँ भाग 3 अल्प प्रतिबल अपघर्षक परीक्षण विधि	—	—
35.	IS 10637—1983 आरथर के नमूने की विच्छिन्न चिमटियों की विशिष्ट	—	—
36.	IS : 10638—1983 फारस्टर के नमूने की स्पंज लगी समतल और बंदानेदार धान्तों वाले चिमटियों की विशिष्ट	—	—
37.	IS : 10644—1983 मशीनी प्रसों की वरीय कम ऊचाईयों की सिफारिश	—	—
38.	IS : 10651—1983 मोपेडों के हब धुरी, अग्रभाग की विशिष्ट	—	—
39.	IS : 10653—1983 मोपेडों के हब धुरी, पिछले भाग की विशिष्ट	—	—

1	2	3	4
40.	IS:10654—1983 एकल प्रयोग हेतु अनुर्वर अधस्तवचीय सूईयों की विशिष्टि	—	—
41.	IS:10655—1983 रबड़ के वाष्प पाइप की विशिष्टि	—	—
42.	IS:10657—1983 पशु आहार के अवयव के रूप में विलायक निष्कषित सोयाबीन की खल (आटा) की विशिष्टि	—	—
43.	IS:10660—1983 वस्त्र प्रबलन वाले रबड़ के द्रविक पाईप की विशिष्टि	—	—
44.	IS:10662—1983 रंगीन दूरदर्शन के प्रसारण एवं प्रेषण हेतु अभिग्रा- हियों की विशिष्टि	—	—
45.	IS:10664—1983 दातों के परि- ष्करण बरों की विशिष्टि	—	—
46.	IS:10668—1983 मलडीहाइड अर्धसल्फाइट निर्जलीय फोटों ग्रेड के सोडियम की विशिष्टि	—	—
47.	IS:10669—1983 कठ वनस्पति के निष्कर्षण की विशिष्टि	—	—
48.	IS:10676—1983 आलिकोना के नमूने की कुट्टनीय दुमट्टी, मस्तिष्क विषयक स्त्रैचुला की विशिष्टि	—	—
49.	IS:10677—1983 कशेरकान्तर मण्डल, रोगों की विशिष्टि	—	—
50.	IS:10680—1983 फोरट्रोन शैली कार्यक्रम	—	—
51.	IS:10681—1983 कोबोल शैली कार्यक्रम	—	—
52.	IS:10682—1983 वायुयान सुरक्षा पेटियां, लेप टाईप वाली की विशिष्टि	—	—
53.	IS:10687—1983 विशाल चौखटी धृक्वावृत्त पात्र की कीलबन्दी की मार्गदर्शिका	—	—
54.	IS:10692—1983 उच्च घनत्व के पालीएथाइलीन के निवार की विशिष्टि	—	—
55.	IS:10696—1983 गोल खण्ड फ्यूज वाले द्विफोस्फो ब्लैकों की विशिष्टि	—	—
56.	IS:10698—1983 छायाओं की उष्मा विसरणशीलता के निर्धारण की पद्धति	—	—

1	2	3	4
57.	IS : 10699—1983 खाद्यानों की विशिष्ट उष्णता के निर्धारण की विधि	—	—
58.	IS : 10726—1983 मांस त्वचा खेदन के चाकू की विशिष्टि	—	—
59.	IS : 10727—1983 वर्गकार अन्तः प्रकोष्ठिका कोल की विशिष्टि	—	—
60.	IS : 10728—1983 वर्गकार बहिः प्रकोष्ठिका कोल की विशिष्टि	—	—
61.	IS : 10729—1983 कन्टसर कोल सेट की विशिष्टि	—	—
62.	IS : 10730—1983 ब्रिटेचर्व मोबेल के नमूने के अस्थिरचदन उपकरण की विशिष्टि	—	—
63.	IS : 10731—1983 शकों के अवस्थापन के लिए अग्रवर्ती स्वाइड ओपनिंग के मायाम	—	—

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक संस्था, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरगाह जकर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली—110002 एवं बम्बई—400007, कलकत्ता 7000072, मद्रास-600113 और मोहाली—160051 स्थित इसके क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों तथा अहमदाबाद—380001, बंगलौर 5600062, भोपाल—462003, भुवनेश्वर 751014, हैदराबाद—500001, जयपुर—302005 कानपुर—208005, पटना—800013 और त्रिवेन्द्रम स्थित शाखा कार्यालयों में बिज्री के लिए उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. सी एस डी / 13 : 2]

S.O. 3795—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of Rule 3 and Sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules and Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established on 1983-12-31:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No. and Title of the Indian Standards Established No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Remarks, if any
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS : 255—1982 Specification for sodium sulphate, anhydrous (technical grade) (Second Revision)	IS : 255—1967 Specification for sodium sulphate, anhydrous (First Revision)	Established on 1982-12-31
2. IS : 524—1983 Specification for varnish, finishing, exterior, synthetic, air drying (Second Revision)	IS : 524—1968 Specification for varnish, finishing, exterior, synthetic (First Revision)	—
3. *IS : 612—1983 Specification for roasted chicory powder (Second Revision)	IS : 612—1971 Specification for roasted chicory powder (First Revision)	*For purposes of ISI Certification Marks Scheme: IS : 612-1983 shall come into force with effect from 1984-08-01
4. IS : 732 (Part II)—1983 Code of practice for electrical wiring installations; Part II Design and construction (Second Revision)	IS : 732—1963 Code of practice for electrical wiring installations (system voltage not exceeding 650 volts) (Revised)	—
5. IS : 1017—1983 Specification for chamols leather (Second Revision)	IS : 1017—1966 Specification for chamols leather (First Revision)	—
6. IS : 1200 (Part 24)—1983 Method of measurement of building and civil engineering works; Part 23 Well foundations (Third Revision)	IS : 1200 (Part xxiv)—1971 Method of measurement of building and civil engineering works; foundations (Second Revision)	—
7. IS : 1424—1983 Specification for cotton canvas (Third Revision)	IS : 1424—1977 Specification for cotton canvas (Second Revision)	—
8. IS : 2161 (Part 2)—1983 Insulation co-ordination Part 2 Phase-to-phase insulation co-ordination, principles and rules	—	—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9. IS: 2167—1983 Specification for bottle coolers (First Revision)	IS: 2167—1962 Specification for bottle coolers	—	—
10. IS: 3374—1983 Specification for preformed steel wire ropes for aircraft controls (First Revision)	IS: 3374—1965 Specification for preformed galvanized steel wire ropes for aircraft controls	—	—
11. IS: 3400 (Part 13)—1983 Methods of test for vulcanized rubbers; Part 13 Tension set (First Revision)	IS: 3400 (Part XIII)—1972 Methods of test for vulcanized rubbers; Part XIII Tension set	—	—
12. IS: 3407 (Part 2)—1983 Method for creep testing of steel at elevated temperatures; Part 2 Tensile creep stress rupture testing (First Revision)	IS: 3407—1955 Method for interrupted creep testing of steel at elevated temperatures (load temperature interrupted)	—	—
13. IS: 3824 (Part 4)—1983 Methods of evaluating dynamic load ratings of rolling bearings; Part 4 Thrust roller bearings (First Revision)	IS: 3824 (Part IV)—1966 Methods evaluating dynamic load ratings of rolling bearings; Part IV Thrust roller bearings	—	—
14. IS: 4037 (Part 2/Sec 3)—1983 Specification terminals for electronic equipment; Part 2 Detail specification for terminals; Section 3 Terminal, non-insulated, with insulated captive screw cap, type TSC 3	—	—	—
15. IS: 4570 (Part 2)—1983 Specification for crystal unit holders; Part 2 Metal, solder seal, two pin crystal unit holders types AA and AB	—	—	—
16. IS: 5786 (Part 8)—1982 Specification for fixed resistors, general purpose, low power; Part 8 Resistor type FRLP 7 (First Revision)	IS: 5786 (Part VI ^F I)—1976 Specification for fixed resistors general purpose, low power; Part VIII Resistors type FR 7	—	—
17. IS: 5868—1983 Method of sampling for leather (First Revision)	IS: 5868—1969 Method of sampling for leather	—	—
18. IS: 6178—1983 Specification for ledged, braced and battened timber door shutters (First Revision)	IS: 6198—1971 Specification for ledged, braced and battened timber door shutters	—	—
19. IS: 8507 (Part 4/Sec 1)—1983 Specification for fixed insulated hermetically sealed tantalum capacitors with solid electrolyte; Part 4 Type FCST 3 Section 1 Polar	—	—	—
20. IS: 8967 (Part 2)—1983 Specification for farm drainage clay tiles; Part 2 Perforated tiles with collar joints	—	—	—
21. IS: 9859 (Part 3)—1983 Code of practice for installation and maintenance of outdoor power line carrier equipment; Part 3 Coupling capacitors/capacitor voltage transformers	—	—	—
22. IS: 10236 (Part 7)—1983 Procedure for basic climatic and durability tests for optical instruments; Part 7 Mould growth test	—	—	—
23. IS: 10242 (Part 2/Sec 2)—1983 Specification for electrical installations in ships; Part 2 System design; Section 2 Protection	—	—	—
24. IS: 10242 (Part 3/Sec 1)—1983 Specification for electrical installations in ships; Part 3 Equipment; Section 1 Generators and motors	—	—	—
25. IS: 10519—1983 Specification for diamond abrasive circular segmental saws	—	—	—
26. IS: 10593—1983 Method of evaluating the analysis of gases in oil-filled electrical equipment in service	—	—	—
27. IS: 10618—1983 Pictorial representation for cautionary notices for power threshers	—	—	—
28. IS: 10619—1983 Specification for seasoned, speced and sweetened cashewnuts	—	—	—
29. IS: 10621—1983 Specification for jelebi mix	—	—	—
30. IS: 10629—1983 Methods for determination of aldicarb residues in crops, soil and water	—	—	—
31. IS: 10630—1983 Methods for determination of methyl parathion residues in foods	—	—	—
32. IS: 10636 (Part 1)—1983 Methods for measurement of abrasive wear properties of metallic material; Part 1. Test method for gouging abrasion resistance (jaw crusher test)	—	—	—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
33. IS: 10636 (Part 2)—1983 Method for measurement of abrasive wear properties of metallic material; Part 2 Test method for high stress abrasion		—	—
34. IS: 10636 (Part 3)—1983 Method for measurement of abrasive wear properties of metallic material; Part 3 Test methods for low stress abrasion		—	—
35. IS: 10637—1983 Specification for forceps, splinter, Arthur's pattern		—	—
36. IS: 10638—1983 Specification for forceps, sponge holding, Foerster's pattern, smooth or serrated jaws		—	—
37. IS: 10644—1983 Recommendation on preferred shut heights for mechanical presses		—	—
38. IS: 10651—1983 Specification for hubaxle, front, for mopeds		—	—
39. IS: 10653—1983 Specification for hubaxle, rear for mopeds		—	—
40. IS: 10654—1983 Specification for sterile hypodermic needles for single use		—	—
41. IS: 10655—1983 Specification for rubber steam hose		—	—
42. IS: 10657—1983 Specification for solvent extracted soyabean ¹ oilcake (meal) as livestock feed ingredient		—	—
43. IS: 10660—1983 Specification for rubber hydraulic hose with textile reinforcement		—	—
44. IS: 10662—1983 Specification for receivers for colour television broadcast transmissions		—	—
45. IS: 10664—1983 Specification for burs, finishing, dental		—	—
46. IS: 10668—1983 Specification for sodium formaldehyde bisulphite, anhydrous, photographic grade		—	—
47. IS : 10669—1983 Specification for mangrove extract		—	—
48. IS: 10676—1983 Specification for spatula, brain, double-ended, malleable, Olivecrona's pattern		—	—
49. IS: 10677—1983 Specification for rongeur, intervertebral disc		—	—
50. IS : 10680—1983 Programming language-fortran		—	—
51. IS : 10681—1983 Programming languages-cobol		—	—
52. IS: 10682—1983 Specification for aircraft safety belts, lap type		—	—
53. IS: 10687—1983 Guidelines for nailing of large framed wooded containers		—	—
54. IS: 10692—1983 Specification for high density polyethylene webbing		—	—
55. IS: 10696—1983 Specification for round segment fused bifocal blanks		—	—
56. IS: 10698—1983 Method for determination of thermal diffusivity of foodgrains		—	—
57. IS: 10699—1983 Method for determination of specific heat of foodgrains		—	—
58. IS: 10726—1983 Specification for knife, metal skin incision		—	—
59. IS: 10727—1983 Specification for nail, square, ulna		—	—
60. IS: 10728—1983 Specification, for nail, square, radius		—	—
61. IS: 10729—1983 Specification for nail set, kuntschar		—	—
62. IS: 10730—1983 Specification for osteotome, whitchurch Howell's pattern		—	—
63. IS: 10731—1983 Dimensions for slide face opening for locating the shanks		—	—

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and also from its regional offices Bombay-400007, Calcutta-700072, Madras-600113 and Mohali-160051 and branch offices at Ahmedabad-380001, Bangalore-560002, Bhopal-462003, Bhubaneswar-751014, Hyderabad-500001, Jaipur-302005, Kanpur-208005, Patna-800013 and Trivandrum-695001

का. 11. 2796:—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिन्ह) विनियम 1955 के नियम 3 के उपविनियम 2 तथा विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (2) और (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था एतद् द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के खोरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे तिथि 1984 01 31 को निर्धारित किए गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम सं. निर्धारित भारतीय मानकों की पदसंख्या एवं शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिरिक्त भारतीय मानक या मानकों, यदि कोई है, कि पदसंख्या एवं शीर्षक	अन्य विवरण
1	2	3
1. IS : 506-1983 आटोमोटिव ग्रीस की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 506-1973 आटोमोटिव ग्रीस की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	भारतीय मानक संस्था की प्रमाणन चिन्ह परियोजना हेतु IS: 506-1983 तिथि 1984-03-01 से लागू होगा।
2. IS: 861-1983 घूँट रूँस के हथकरघे के सूती जेकोनेट कपड़े की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 861-1956 घूँट रूँस के हथकरघे के सूती जेकोनेट कपड़े की विशिष्टि	—
3. IS: 971-1983 पसीना ग्राने पर वस्त्रादि के रंग का पक्कापन ज्ञात करने की विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 971-1956 पसीना ग्राने पर वस्त्रादि के रंग का पक्कापन ज्ञात करने की विशिष्टि	—
4. IS : 1390-1983 वस्त्रादि के जलांश का पी एच मान के निर्धारण की विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 1390-1961 वस्त्रादि के जलांश का पी एच मान के निर्धारण की विधि	—
5. IS : 1410-1983 नारियल जटा की रस्सियों की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 1410-1973 नारियल जटा की रस्सियों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	—
6. IS: 1422-1983 मोटे सूती कपड़े की विशिष्टि (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 1422-1977 मोटे सूती कपड़े की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—
7. IS: 1538 (भाग 24)-1982 पानी, गै. एवं मलजल के लिए दाब पाइपों की ढलवाँ लोहे की फिटिंग की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 1538-1969 पानी, गै. एवं मलजल के लिए दाब पाइपों की ढलवाँ लोहे की फिटिंग (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	1983-02-28 को स्थापित
8. IS: 1885 (भाग 52/खण्ड 14)-1983 वैद्युत-तकनीकी शब्दावली, भाग 52 सामग्री प्रक्रिया, खण्ड 14 परिकलक आलेखी एवं परिकलक सूक्ष्मलेखीय	—	—
9. IS: 2032 (भाग 28)-1983 विद्युत औद्योगिकी में प्रयुक्त आलेखीय प्रतीक भाग 28 परिवर्तक	—	—
10. IS: 2987-1983 मशीन औजारों के नियंत्रण के प्रचालन के निर्देशन की सिफारिशें (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 2987-1965 मशीन औजारों के नियंत्रण के प्रचालन के निर्देशन की सिफारिशें	—
11. IS: *3317-1983 अधस्त्वचीय सूइयों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3317-1965 सूइयों की विशिष्टि, अधस्त्वचीय	*भारतीय मानक संस्था की प्रमाणन चिन्ह परियोजना हेतु IS : 3317-1983 तिथि 1984-06-01 से लागू होगा।
12. IS: 3407 (भाग 1)-1983 उन्नत तापमानों पर इस्पात के विसर्पण परीक्षण की विधि भाग 1 तनन विसर्पण परीक्षण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3407-1965 उन्नत तापमानों पर इस्पात के बाधित विसर्पण परीक्षण की विधि (भार एवं तापमान बाधित)	—

1	2	3	4
13. IS: 3640-1982 षड्भुज फिट चटखनियों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3640-1967 षड्भुज फिट चटखनियों की विशिष्टि	---	
14. IS: 3775-1983 सूती खादी के विरंजित/रंजित तोलिया कपड़े की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3775-1966 सूती खादी के विरंजित तोलिया कपड़ा की विशिष्टि	---	
15. IS: 3785-1983 विकेट रक्षा के दस्तानों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3785-1966 विकेट रक्षा के दस्तानों की विशिष्टि	---	
16. IS: 3800-1983 बल्लेबाजी के दस्तानों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3800-1966 बल्लेबाजी के दस्तानों की विशिष्टि	---	
17. IS: 3824 (भाग 3)-1983 बेलन धारक के गतिशील भार वर्ग के मूल्यांकन की विधियाँ, भाग 3 नोद गोली धारक (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3824 (भाग 3)-1966 बेलन धारक के स्थाई भार वर्ग के मूल्यांकन की विधियाँ, भाग 3 नोद गोली धारक	---	
18. IS: 4007-(भाग 2/खण्ड 1)-1983 विद्युत उपस्कर के सिरों की विशिष्टि, भाग 2 सिरों की विस्तृत विशिष्टि, खण्ड 1 रोधित विमोहित पेंच टोपी वाले रोधित सिरे, टी एस सी 1 टाइप	---	---	
19. IS: 4007 (भाग 2/खण्ड 4)-1983 विद्युत उपस्कर के सिरों की विशिष्टि, भाग 2 सिरों की विस्तृत विशिष्टि, खण्ड 4 रोधित विमोहित पेंच टोपी वाले रोधित सिरे, टी एस सी 4 टाइप	---	---	
20. IS: 4007 (भाग 2/खण्ड 5)-1983 इलेक्ट्रॉनिक उपकरणों के सिरों की विशिष्टि, भाग 2 सिरों की विस्तृत विशिष्टि, खण्ड 5 किनारे से क्षिरीदार रोधित विमोहित पेंच टोपी वाले रोधित सिरे, टी एस सी 5 टाइप	---	---	
21. IS: 4052-1983 कमानी परकार की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4052-1967 कमानी परकार की विशिष्टि	---	
22. IS: 4076-1983 कमानियों और अन्य विशेष कार्यों के लिए कठोर पीतल के तारों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4076-1967 कमानियों एवं अन्य विशेष कार्यों के लिए कठोर पीतल के तारों की विशिष्टि	---	
23. IS: 4171-1983 सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए ताम्बे की शलाखाएं एवं छड़ों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4171-1967 सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए ताम्बे की छड़ों की विशिष्टि	---	
24. IS: 4558-1983 अस्तरदार नहरों के नीचे के जल निकास की रीति संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4558-1968 अस्तरदार नहरों के नीचे के जल निकास की रीति संहिता	---	
25. IS: 4575-1983 तन्तु रस्सों के संभालने की रीति संहिता (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4575-1973 तन्तु रस्सों के संभालने की रीति संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	---	
26. IS: 4828-1983 जस्ता मिश्र धातुओं पर ताम्बा, निकल एवं क्रोमियम के विद्युत-आवरणित लेपों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 4828-1968 जस्ता एवं जस्ता मिश्र धातुओं पर निकल और क्रोमियम के विद्युत-आवरणित लेपों की विशिष्टि	---	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27. IS : 4942-1983 एलुमिनियम एवं एलुमिनियम मिश्र धातुओं पर निकल और क्रोमियम के विद्युत आवरणित लेपों की विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 4942-1969 एलुमिनियम मिश्र धातुओं पर निकल एवं क्रोमियम के विद्युत-आवरणित लेपों की विशिष्ट	—	
28. IS : 5206-1983 विकाररहित इस्पात और अन्य वैसे ही उच्च मिश्र धातुओं इस्पातों के हाथ द्वारा धातु, आर्क सलाई के आच्छादित विद्युतय की विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 5206-1969 हस्तचालित धातु आर्क सलाई में जंग रोधी क्रोमियम एवं क्रोमियम निकल इस्पात आच्छादित विद्युतय की विशिष्ट	—	
29. IS : 5298-1983 आवाहन रेन्ज और आवाहन उत्पादन के निर्धारण की विधि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 5298-1969 आवाहन रेन्ज और आवाहन उत्पादन के निर्धारण की विधि	---	
30. IS : 5523-1983 एलुमिनियम और उसके मिश्र धातुओं पर एनोडिक लेपों के परीक्षण की विधियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 5523-1969 एलुमिनियम पर एनोडिक लेपों के परीक्षण की विधियाँ	---	
31. IS : 5786(भाग-10)-1982 अल्प शक्ति के सामान्य कार्यों के स्थिर प्रतिरोधकों की विशिष्ट, भाग 10 एक आर एल पी टाइप के प्रतिरोधक	IS : 5786 (भाग 10)-1976 अल्प शक्ति के सामान्य कार्यों के स्थिर प्रतिरोधकों की विशिष्ट, भाग 10 एक आर 9 टाइप के प्रतिरोधक	1983-02-20	
32. IS : 6169-1983 खाद्य पदार्थों में बी एच सी (एच सी एच) अवशेषों के निर्धारण की विधियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 6169-1971 खाद्यानों में बी एच सी अवशेषों के निर्धारण की जाँच विधि	---	
33. IS : 7405(भाग 1)-1983 मुद्रित तारों के बाड़ों की विशिष्ट, भाग 1 सामान्य अपेक्षाएं एवं जाँच विधियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 7405(भाग 1)-1973 मुद्रित तारों के बाड़ों की विशिष्ट भाग 1 सामान्य अपेक्षाएं एवं जाँच	---	
34. IS : 7875(भाग 4)-1983 कपड़ा मिलों में प्रयुक्त छिपटी छिन्नों की विशिष्ट, भाग 4 उच्च घनत्व के पोलोएथाइलीन के छिपटी छिन्न			
35. IS : 8049-1983 प्लेटफार्म दूकों की विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 8049-1976 हस्तचालित चालित दूकों की विशिष्ट	---	
36. IS : 8132-1983 कृषि ट्रैक्टरों एवं मशीनरी के लिए प्रचालक की नियमावली और तकनीकी प्रकाशनों के प्रस्तुतीकरण की मार्गदर्शिका (पहला-पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 8132-1976 कृषि ट्रैक्टरों एवं मशीनरी के लिए प्रचालक नियमावली और तकनीकी प्रकाशनों के प्रस्तुतीकरण की मार्गदर्शिका	---	
37. IS : 8265-1983 विद्युत चालित शाकट गाड़ों की परीक्षण विधियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 8265-1976 विद्युत-चालित शाकट गाड़ों की परीक्षण विधियाँ	---	
38. IS : 14054-1983 अनुवावों के प्रस्तुतीकरण की मार्गदर्शिका	---		
39. IS : 10589-1983 उपतल की मिट्टी (भूमि) को ठोस बनाने के उपस्कर की विशिष्ट	---		
40. IS : 10596(भाग 4)—1983 औद्योगिक प्रयोग के पम्पों के चयन, संस्थापन, प्रचालन एवं रख रखाव की रीति संहिता, भाग-4, रख रखाव	---		

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
41.	IS : 10605-1983 इंडोलियम, पेडोरसामन एवं सम्बद्ध उद्योगों के (कोरवार और कुन्दा- भाजित किनारों वाले) इस्पात के गोल वाइबों की विशिष्टि	—	—
42.	IS : 10612-1983 चार जंघों वाली स्वावलम्बी खराब टेक की विशिष्टि	—	—
43.	IS : 10640-1983 साकसलेट निष्कर्षक की विशिष्टि	—	—
44.	IS : 10646-1983 नहर अस्तरों के सम्पीडित पूर्व निर्मित सीमेन्ट कंक्रीट टाइलों की विशिष्टि	—	—
45.	IS : 10647-1983 पहिया बियरिंग ग्रीज की विशिष्टि	—	—
46.	IS : 10656-1983 रोधन प्रतिरोध परीक्षक (इलेक्ट्रोनी टाइप एसपीडी 7:16) की विशिष्टि	—	—
47.	IS : 10658-1983 (दाली आरोहणित उच्च श्रमता वाले शुष्क चूर्ण के अग्नि शामक की विशिष्टि	—	—
48.	IS : 10659-1983 प्रतिरोध मापने के डी सी सेलुओं की विशिष्टि	—	—
49.	IS : 10674-1983 सेमल की रुई भरे सूते के ढंग की विशिष्टि	—	—
50.	IS : 10678-1983 निर्यात उत्पादक के डिजाइन/चयन का आंकड़ा पत्र	—	—
51.	IS : 10690-1983 सूचना प्रक्रिया में प्रयुक्त अछिद्रित कागज पत्रकों की विशिष्टि	—	—
52.	IS : 10695-1983 जेब त्रिविधता की विशिष्टि	—	—
53.	IS : 10697-1983 कार्पासो में डिब्बा बंद बिजों की विशिष्टि	—	—
54.	IS : 10700-1983 बीडियों रिकाडिंग एवं पुनरुत्पादन हेतु चुम्बक टेपों की मापन विधियाँ	—	—
55.	IS : 10701-1983 संरचना प्लाईवुड की विशिष्टि	—	—
56.	IS : 10702—1983 रबड़ की हवाई चप्पलों की विशिष्टि	—	—
57.	IS : 10703—1983 कृषि ट्रैक्टरों पर नियंत्रण बल जेरण की सिफारिशें	—	—
58.	IS : 10705—1983 संयंत्रों एवं सम्बद्ध प्रतिमार रिले के अंतकों की पहचान	—	—
59.	IS : 10709—1983 फोरडाइनियर कपड़ों के लिए पीतल के तारों की विशिष्टि	—	—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60. IS : 10710—1983 फोरवार्डिंगमिटर कपड़े के फास्कर कास्ट्रारों की विशिष्टि	---	---	
61. IS : 107231— 983 एन्विनिमियम बिलिकान कास्ट्रार की छड़ों एवं सरियों की विशिष्टि	---	---	
62. IS : 10724—1983 इस्पात कलाई के चुम्बकीय कणों के निरीक्षण के लिए स्वीकार्य मानकों की विशिष्टि	---	---	
63. IS : 10725-1983 मिनिगोटोमी चाकू की विशिष्टि	---	---	
64. IS : 10739-1983 8 मिमी डाइप एल चलचित्र के कैमरा कार्डरिज के माइल 1 कैमरा इंटरसेल और टेक अपकोर डाइप के माप	---	---	
65. IS : 10749-1983 पुशर-लेग में पेच डाइप आरोपण के घूमने वाली शीर्ष दिशारियों की विशिष्टि	---	---	

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक संस्था, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरसाह जकर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और बम्बई-400007, कलकत्ता-700072, भद्राल-600115 एवं मोहाली-160051 स्थित इनके क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों तथा अग्राहा - 50001, बंगलोर-560002, भोपाल-462003, मुंबई-751014, गुवाहाटी-781001, जयपुर-302005, कानपुर-208005, पटना- 800013, एवं त्रिवेन्द्रम-695001 स्थित शाखा कार्यालयों में बिक्री के लिए उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. सीएमडी 13:2]

S.O.3796:—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 3 and Sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, and Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established on 1984-01-31 :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of the Indian Standard Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Remarks, if any
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	*IS : 506—1933 Specification for automotive grease (Second Revision)	IS : 506—1973 Specification for automotive grease (First Revision)	*For purposes of ISI Certification Mark Scheme; IS : 506—1933 came into force with effect from 1934-01-01
2.	IS : 861—1983 Specification for handloom cotton jacquet cloth, grey, dressed (First Revision)	IS : 851—1936 Specification for handloom cotton jacquet cloth, grey dressed	—
3.	IS : 971—1983 Method for determination of colour fastness of textile materials to perspiration (First Revision)	IS : 971—1956 Method for determination of colour fastness of textile materials to perspiration	—
4.	IS : 1390—1983 Methods for determination of pH value of aqueous extracts of textile materials (First Revision)	IS : 1390—1951 Methods for determination of pH value of aqueous extracts of textile materials	—
5.	IS : 1410—1983 Specification for coir ropes (Second Revision)	IS : 1410—1973 Specification for coir rope (First Revision)	—
6.	IS : 1422—1983 Specification for cotton duck (Third Revision)	IS : 1422—1977 Specification for cotton duck (Second Revision)	—
7.	IS : 1538 (Part XXIV)—1982 Specification for cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage; Part XXIV Specific requirements for all flanged radial tees (Second Revision)	IS : 1538—1959 Specification for cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage (First Revision)	Established on 1933-02-23

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
8.	IS : 1885 (Part 52/Sec 14)—1983 Electrotechnical vocabulary; Part 52 Data processing; Section 14 Computer graphics and computer micrographics			—	—
9.	IS : 2032 (Part 28)—1933 Graphical symbols used in electrotechnology; Part 28 Transformers			—	—
10.	IS : 2937—1983 Recommendations for direction of operation of controls for machine tools (First Revision)		IS : 2987—1965 Recommendations for direction of operation of controls for machine tools		—
11.	*IS : 3317—1983 Specification for hypodermic needles (First Revision)		IS : 3317—1965 Specification for needles, hypodermic		*For purposes of ISI Certification Marks Scheme; IS : 3317—1933 came into force with effect from 1984-06-01
12.	IS : 3407 (Part I)—1983 Method for creep testing of steel at elevated temperatures; Part 1 Tensile creep testing (First Revision)		IS : 3407—1965 Method for interrupted creep testing of steel at elevated temperatures (load and temperature interrupted)		—
13.	IS : 3640—1982 Specification for hexagon fit bolts (First Revision)		IS : 3640—1967 Specification for hexagon fit bolts		—
14.	IS : 3775—1983 Specification for huckaback towels, cotton khadi, bleached/dyed (First Revision)		IS : 3775—1966 Specification for huckaback towels, cotton khadi, bleached		—
15.	IS : 3785—1983 Specification for wicket keeping gloves (First Revision)		IS : 3785—1966 Specification for wicket keeping gauntlets		—
16.	IS : 3800—1983 Specification for batting gloves (First Revision)		IS : 3800—1965 Specification for batting gloves		—
17.	IS : 3824 (Part 3)—1983 Methods of evaluating dynamic load ratings of rolling bearings; Part 3 Thrust ball bearings (First Revision)		IS : 3824 (Part III)—1966 Methods of evaluating static load ratings of rolling bearings; Part III Thrust ball bearings		—
18.	IS : 4007 (Part 2/Sec 1)—1983 Specification for terminals for electronic equipment; Part 2 Detail specification for terminals; Section 1 terminal, insulated, with insulated captive screw cap, Type TSC 1			—	—
19.	IS : 4007 (Part 2/Sec 4)—1983 Specification for terminals for electronic equipment; Part 2 Detail specification for terminals; Section 4 Terminal, insulated, with insulated captive screw cap, type TSC 4			—	—
20.	IS : 4007 (Part 2/Sec 5)—1983 Specification for terminals for electronic equipment; Part 2 Detail specification for terminals; Section 5 Terminals, insulated, side slotted with insulated captive screw cap, type TSC 5			—	—
21.	IS : 4052—1983 Specification for spring callipers (First Revision)		IS : 4052—1967 Specification for spring calipers		—
22.	IS : 4076—1983 Specification for hard brass wires for springs and other special purposes (First Revision)		IS : 4076—1967 Specification for hard brass wires for springs and other special purposes		—
23.	IS : 4171—1983 Specification for copper rods and bars, for general engineering purposes (First Revision)		IS : 4171—1967 Specification for copper rods for general engineering purposes		—
24.	IS : 4558—1983 Code of practice for under-drainage of lined canals (First Revision)		IS : 4558—1968 Code of practice for under-drainage of lined canals		—
25.	IS : 4575—1983 Code for handling of fibre ropes (Second Revision)		IS : 4575—1973 Code for handling of fibre ropes (First Revision)		—
26.	IS : 4828—1983 Specification for electroplated coatings of copper, nickel and chromium on zinc alloys (First Revision)		IS : 4828—1968 Specification for electroplated coatings of nickel and chromium on zinc and zinc alloy		—
27.	IS : 4942—1983 Specification for electroplated coating of nickel and chromium on aluminium and aluminium alloys (First Revision)		IS : 4942—1969 Specification for electroplated coatings of nickel and chromium on aluminium alloys		—
28.	IS : 5206—1983 Specification for covered electrodes for manual metal arc welding of stainless steel and other similar high alloy steels (First Revision)		IS : 5206—1969 Specification for corrosion-resisting chromium and chromium-nickel steel covered electrodes for manual metal arc welding		—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
29. IS : 5223—1983 Method for determination of distillation range and distillation yield (First Revision)	IS : 5298—1969 Method for determination of distillation range and of distillation yield	—	
30. IS : 5523—1983 Methods of testing anodic coatings on aluminium and its alloys (First Revision)	IS : 5523—1969 Methods of testing anodic coatings on aluminium	—	
31. IS : 5786 (Part X)—1982 Specification for fixed resistors, general purpose, low power; Part X Resistors type FRLP 9 (First Revision)	IS : 5786 (Part X)—1972 Specification for fixed resistors general purpose low power; Part X Resistors type FR 9	Established on 1983-02-28	
32. IS : 6169—1983 Methods for determination of BHC (HCH) residues in food commodities (First Revision)	IS : 6169—1971 Method of test for the determination of BHC residues in food-grains	—	
33. IS : 7405 (Part 1)—1983 Specification for printed wiring boards; Part I General requirements and methods of test (First Revision)	IS : 7405 (Part I)—1973 Specification for printed wiring boards; Part I General requirements and tests	—	
34. IS : 7875 (Part 4)—1983 Specification for silver cans used in testile mills; Part 4 High density polyethylene silver cans	—	—	
35. IS : 8049—1983 Specification for platforms trucks (First Revision)	IS : 8049—1976 Specification for hand trucks	—	
36. IS : 8132—1983 Guidelines for presentation of operator manuals and technical publications for agricultural tractors and machinery (First Revision)	IS : 8132—1976 Guidelines for presentation of operator manuals and technical publications for agricultural tractors and machinery	—	
37. IS : 8265—1983 Methods of test for power take-off drive shaft guard (First Revision)	IS : 8265—1976 Methods of test for power take-off drive-shaft guard	—	
38. IS : 10454—1983 Guidelines for presentation of translations	—	—	
39. IS : 10589—1983 Specification for equipment for subsurface sounding of soils	—	—	
40. IS : 10596 (Part 4)—1983 Code of practice for selection, installation, operation and maintenance of pumps for industrial applications; Part 4 Maintenance	—	—	
41. IS : 10605—1983 Specification for steel globe valves (Flanged and butt-welded ends) for petroleum, petrochemical and allied industries	—	—	
42. IS : 10612—1983 Specification for 4-jaw independent lathe chucks	—	—	
43. IS : 10640—1983 Specification for soxhlet extractors	—	—	
44. IS : 10646—1983 Specification for compressed precast concrete tiles for canal linings	—	—	
45. IS : 10647—1983 Specification for wheel bearing grease	—	—	
46. IS : 10656—1983 Specification for insulation resistance tester (Electronic type)	—	—	
47. IS : 10658—1983 Specification for higher capacity dry powder fire extinguisher (Trolley mounted)	—	—	
48. IS : 10659—1983 Specification for DC bridges for measuring resistance	—	—	
49. IS : 10674—1983 Specification for bag, sleeping, kapok-filled	—	—	
50. IS : 10678—1983 Data sheet for design/selection of vacuum producer	—	—	
51. IS : 10690—1983 Specification for unpunched papercards used for information processing	—	—	
52. IS : 10695—1983 Specification for pocket stereoscope	—	—	
53. IS : 10697—1983 Specification for chicken canned in brine	—	—	
54. IS : 10700—1983 Methods of measurement for magnetic tapes for video recording and reproduction	—	—	
55. IS : 10701—1983 Specification for structural plywood	—	—	

1	2	3	4	5	6
56.	IS : 10702—1983	Specification for rubber hawal chappal	—	—	—
57.	IS : 10703—1983	Recommendation for actuating forces for controls on agricultural tractors	—	—	—
58.	IS : 10705—1983	Identification of terminals of contractors and associated overload relays	—	—	—
59.	IS : 10709—1983	Specification for brass wires for fourdrinier cloth	—	—	—
60.	IS : 10710—1983	Specification for phosphor bronze wires for fourdrinier cloth	—	—	—
61.	IS : 10723—1983	Specification for aluminium silicon bronze rods and bars	—	—	—
62.	IS : 10724—1983	Specification for acceptance standards for magnetic particle inspection of steel castings	—	—	—
63.	IS : 10725—1983	Specification for knife, myringotomy	—	—	—
64.	IS : 10739—1983	Dimensions for model I-cartridge camera interface and take up core drive of 8 mm type S motion picture camera cartridge	—	—	—
65.	IS : 10749—1983	Specification for swivel head nut for screw type mounts in pusher less	—	—	—

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standards Institution, Marak Bhawan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and also from its regional offices: Bombay-400007, Calcutta-700072, Madras-600013 and Mumbai-150051 and branch offices at Ahmedabad-380001, Bangalore-560002, Bhopal-462003, Bhubaneswar-751014, Hyderabad-500001, Jaipur-302005, Kanpur-203005, Patna-800013 and Trivandrum-695001.

[No. CMD/13:2]

का. भा. 3797 :—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन 342 लाइसेंसों के व्योरे नोंके अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, उनका अवतार, 1985 में नवीकरण किया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	सीएम/एल संख्या	वैध: तक
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	0019526	1986-09-30
2.	0031718	1986-10-31
3.	0034926	1986-10-31
4.	0061626	1986-10-15
5.	0065331	1986-08-15
6.	0111211	1986-08-15
7.	0128226	1986-09-30
8.	0134021	1986-09-30
9.	0146230	1986-09-30
10.	0151728	1986-09-15
11.	0161327	1986-01-31
12.	0167440	1986-10-15
13.	0181030	1986-09-30
14.	0184137	1986-09-30
15.	0210415	1986-10-15
16.	0211013	1986-10-15
17.	0226228	1986-09-30
18.	0239338	1986-10-15
19.	0273035	1986-10-31
20.	0277245	1986-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)
21.	0277649	1986-09-30
22.	0278348	1986-10-15
23.	0284242	1986-08-31
24.	0303927	1986-10-15
25.	0318233	1986-10-15
26.	0354439	1986-09-30
27.	0378655	1986-09-30
28.	0392144	1986-09-30
29.	0394754	1986-07-31
30.	0398318	1986-10-15
31.	0399562	1986-09-30
32.	0411021	1986-09-30
33.	0419340	1986-09-30
34.	0425234	1986-09-30
35.	0425941	1986-09-30
36.	0426034	1986-09-30
37.	0428442	1986-09-30
38.	0433132	1986-07-15
39.	0458956	1986-09-30
40.	0463848	1986-09-15
41.	0465044	1986-09-30
42.	0471645	1986-09-30
43.	0472243	1986-06-30
44.	0478861	1986-04-30
45.	0483450	1986-08-31
46.	0483753	1986-09-30
47.	0489761	1986-09-30
48.	0496459	1986-09-15
49.	0507135	1986-09-30
50.	0508339	1986-09-30
51.	0508440	1986-09-30
52.	0520430	1986-09-15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
53.	0523335	1986-09-15	119.	0792160	1986-08-15
54.	0544141	1986-08-31	120.	0793061	1986-09-30
55.	0545749	1986-09-15	121.	0793566	1986-08-31
56.	0546751	1986-09-15	122.	0794164	1986-08-31
57.	0546852	1986-09-15	123.	0794871	1986-08-31
58.	0547248	1986-09-15	124.	0795166	1986-08-31
59.	0548250	1986-08-31	125.	0795873	1986-08-31
60.	0555348	1986-09-30	126.	0798172	1986-09-15
61.	0556855	1986-09-30	127.	0798273	1986-09-15
62.	0557756	1986-10-15	128.	0798475	1986-09-15
63.	0561040	1986-09-30	129.	0800840	1986-09-30
64.	0572348	1986-03-15	130.	0800941	1986-09-30
65.	0587361	1986-09-30	131.	0802036	1986-09-30
66.	0593457	1986-08-15	132.	0802541	1986-09-30
67.	0610532	1986-09-30	133.	0802642	1986-09-30
68.	0612940	1986-09-30	134.	0803341	1986-09-30
69.	0616443	1986-09-30	135.	0804141	1986-10-15
70.	0620030	1986-06-30	136.	0813243	1986-08-31
71.	0625343	1986-07-15	137.	0820038	1986-10-31
72.	0626749	1986-09-15	138.	0826151	1986-09-15
73.	0629351	1986-09-30	139.	0845862	1986-10-31
74.	0632340	1986-09-30	140.	0858164	1986-08-15
75.	0638857	1986-08-31	141.	0859974	1986-09-30
76.	0641038	1986-09-30	142.	0860757	1986-06-15
77.	0642646	1986-09-30	143.	0864462	1986-09-30
78.	0643951	1986-09-30	144.	0885470	1986-08-15
79.	0644145	1986-09-30	145.	0886270	1986-08-15
80.	0644246	1986-09-30	146.	0886371	1986-08-15
81.	0645248	1986-10-15	147.	0887676	1986-08-15
82.	0647353	1986-10-31	148.	0887777	1986-08-15
83.	0649054	1986-08-31	149.	0888678	1986-08-15
84.	0649256	1985-10-31	150.	089 972	1986-09-15
85.	0663149	1986-09-30	151.	0893469	1986-08-31
86.	0663250	1986-09-30	152.	0898277	1986-09-30
87.	0670348	1986-10-15	153.	0898883	1986-09-30
88.	0692257	1986-04-15	154.	0899178	1986-09-30
89.	0707951	1986-06-30	155.	0899481	1986-09-30
90.	0712944	1986-07-31	156.	0899582	1986-09-30
91.	0713138	1986-07-31	157.	0900743	1986-09-30
92.	0714039	1986-08-31	158.	0901038	1985-09-30
93.	0714140	1986-09-30	159.	0901139	1986-09-30
94.	0716346	1986-08-31	160.	0901644	1986-09-30
95.	0716649	1986-08-31	161.	0902949	1986-10-15
96.	0718754	1986-09-15	162.	0903042	1986-10-15
97.	0719150	1986-09-15	163.	0905753	1986-10-15
98.	0719251	1986-09-15	164.	0944359	1986-02-28
99.	0720539	1986-09-15	165.	0964365	1986-06-30
100.	0720741	1986-09-30	166.	0969375	1986-09-30
101.	0720943	1986-09-15	167.	0977576	1986-07-15
102.	0721137	1986-09-30	168.	0978275	1986-06-30
103.	0721945	1986-09-15	169.	0985272	1986-10-15
104.	0723141	1986-09-30	170.	0988076	1986-08-31
105.	0723444	1986-09-30	171.	0988985	1986-08-31
106.	0723545	1986-09-15	172.	0989078	1986-08-31
107.	0724143	1986-09-30	173.	0990770	1986-09-15
108.	0728656	1986-10-31	174.	0991772	1986-09-15
109.	0740949	1986-10-31	175.	0993271	1986-09-15
110.	0757360	1986-08-31	176.	0994071	1986-09-15
111.	0760147	1986-08-31	177.	0995275	1986-09-30
112.	0769266	1986-04-15	178.	0995477	1986-09-30
113.	0773156	1986-04-30	179.	0995679	1986-09-30
114.	0777770	1986-08-31	180.	0996075	1986-09-30
115.	0779673	1986-07-31	181.	0996883	1987-02-15
116.	0786064	1986-07-31	182.	0997077	1986-09-30
117.	0787773	1986-07-31	183.	0997178	1986-09-30
118.	0791865	1986-08-15			

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
184.	0998079	1986-09-30	250.	1224532	1986-08-15
185.	0998180	1986-09-30	251.	1226334	1986-08-15
186.	0998382	1986-09-30	252.	1226536	1986-08-15
187.	0998786	1986-09-30	253.	1227336	1986-08-31
188.	0999081	1986-09-30	254.	1227841	1986-08-15
189.	0999182	1986-09-30	255.	1228742	1986-08-31
190.	0999485	1986-10-15	256.	1228843	1986-08-31
191.	0999687	1986-10-15	257.	1230325	1986-08-31
192.	1901815	1986-10-15	258.	1233230	1986-09-30
193.	1906421	1986-11-15	259.	1233735	1986-09-30
194.	1034426	1986-02-15	260.	1234636	1986-09-15
195.	1038333	1986-10-15	261.	1235133	1986-09-30
196.	1039739	1986-09-15	262.	1235234	1986-09-30
197.	1042122	1986-06-30	263.	1235335	1986-09-15
198.	1045734	1986-09-15	264.	1235638	1986-09-30
199.	1048336	1986-10-15	265.	1235739	1986-09-30
200.	1054038	1986-06-31	266.	1235941	1987-03-31
201.	1063433	1986-08-30	267.	1238640	1986-09-30
202.	1063837	1986-04-15	268.	1236741	1986-09-30
203.	1072232	1986-10-15	269.	1237743	1986-10-15
204.	1085342	1986-09-30	270.	1237945	1986-09-30
205.	1091430	1986-06-30	271.	1238644	1986-10-15
206.	1063139	1986-06-30	272.	1240429	1986-10-15
207.	1104320	1986-08-15	273.	1241027	1986-10-15
208.	1106526	1986-08-15	274.	1241128	1986-10-15
209.	1107023	1986-07-31	275.	1241936	1986-10-31
210.	1107427	1986-08-15	276.	1243536	1986-10-31
211.	1108530	1986-08-31	277.	1254339	1986-12-15
212.	1109936	1986-08-31	278.	1271137	1986-01-31
213.	1110012	1986-08-31	279.	1302829	1986-04-15
214.	1110113	1986-08-31	280.	1306130	1986-04-30
215.	1110719	1986-08-31	281.	1312428	1986-05-31
216.	1112016	1986-09-15	282.	1312529	1986-05-31
217.	1112117	1986-09-15	283.	1319745	1986-06-30
218.	1114222	1986-08-31	284.	1322835	1986-07-15
219.	1115325	1986-09-15	285.	1323736	1986-07-15
220.	1115931	1986-09-15	286.	1328039	1986-07-31
221.	1116428	1986-08-31	287.	1328948	1987-02-15
222.	1116529	1986-09-15	288.	1329142	1986-08-15
223.	1116731	1986-09-30	289.	1322243	1986-07-31
224.	1116933	1986-09-30	290.	1329647	1986-08-15
225.	1117632	1986-09-30	291.	1330228	1986-08-15
226.	1117834	1986-09-30	292.	1330329	1986-08-15
227.	1118634	1986-09-30	293.	1331028	1986-08-15
228.	1118735	1986-09-30	294.	1331129	1986-08-15
229.	1119838	1986-09-30	295.	1331230	1986-08-15
230.	1120015	1986-10-15	296.	1332535	1986-08-31
231.	1120116	1986-10-15	297.	1332838	1986-08-15
232.	1120419	1986-10-15	298.	1332939	1986-08-15
233.	1120924	1986-10-15	299.	1334135	1986-08-31
234.	1122019	1986-09-30	300.	1334236	1986-08-31
235.	1122423	1986-10-15	301.	1334337	1986-08-31
236.	1122726	1986-12-31	302.	1334438	1986-08-31
237.	1123930	1986-10-15	303.	1334539	1986-08-31
238.	1127534	1986-09-30	304.	1334741	1986-08-31
239.	1154937	1986-09-15	305.	1334842	1986-08-31
240.	1165037	1986-02-28	306.	1335038	1986-08-31
241.	1182239	1986-04-30	307.	1335238	1986-08-31
242.	1194751	1986-06-15	308.	1335541	1986-08-31
243.	1206023	1986-06-30	309.	1337242	1986-08-31
244.	1211119	1986-06-30	310.	1338042	1986-08-31
245.	1211422	1986-06-30	311.	1338143	1986-08-31
246.	1213426	1986-09-30	312.	1338446	1986-08-31
247.	1224229	1986-08-15	313.	1338648	1986-08-31
248.	1224330	1986-08-15	314.	1339044	1986-09-15
249.	1224431	1986-08-15			

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
315.	1339145	1986-09-15	21.	0277649	1986-07-30
316.	1339549	1986-09-15	22.	0278348	1986-10-15
317.	1339953	1986-09-15	23.	0284242	1986-08-31
318.	1340130	1986-09-15	24.	0303927	1986-10-15
319.	1340433	1986-09-15	25.	0318233	1986-10-15
320.	1340635	1986-09-15	26.	0354139	1986-09-30
321.	1340736	1986-09-15	27.	0378655	1986-09-30
322.	1341334	1986-09-15	28.	0392144	1986-09-30
323.	1342033	1987-04-30	29.	0394754	1986-07-31
324.	1342356	1986-09-30	30.	0398358	1986-10-15
325.	1342437	1986-08-31	31.	0399562	1986-09-30
326.	1342740	1986-09-30	32.	0411021	1986-09-30
327.	1342841	1986-09-30	33.	0419340	1986-09-30
328.	1342942	1986-09-30	34.	0425234	1986-09-30
329.	1343055	1986-09-30	35.	0425941	1986-09-30
330.	1344138	1986-09-30	36.	0426034	1986-09-30
331.	1344239	1986-09-30	37.	0428442	1986-09-30
332.	1344441	1986-09-30	38.	0433132	1986-07-15
333.	1344946	1986-09-30	39.	0458956	1986-09-30
334.	1345544	1986-09-30	40.	0463348	1986-09-15
335.	1345948	1986-09-30	41.	0465044	1986-09-30
336.	1346243	1986-09-30	42.	0471645	1986-09-30
337.	1346445	1986-10-15	43.	0472243	1987-05-30
338.	1348849	1986-10-15	44.	0478861	1986-04-30
339.	1346950	1986-10-15	45.	0483450	1986-08-31
340.	1347144	1986-10-15	46.	0483753	1986-09-30
341.	1348247	1986-10-15	47.	0489361	1986-09-30
342.	1348449	1986-10-15	48.	0496459	1986-09-15
			49.	0507135	1986-09-30
			50.	0508339	1986-09-30
			51.	0508440	1986-09-30
			52.	0520430	1986-09-15
			53.	0523335	1986-09-15
			54.	0544141	1985-08-31
			55.	0545749	1986-09-15
			56.	0546751	1986-09-15
			57.	0546852	1986-09-15
			58.	0547248	1986-09-15
			59.	0548250	1986-03-31
			60.	0555348	1986-09-30
			61.	0556855	1986-09-30
			62.	0557756	1986-10-15
			63.	0561040	1986-09-30
			64.	0572348	1986-01-15
			65.	0587361	1986-09-30
			66.	0593457	1986-08-15
			67.	0610532	1986-09-30
			68.	0612940	1986-09-30
			69.	0616443	1986-09-30
			70.	0620030	1986-06-30
			71.	0625343	1986-07-15
			72.	0626749	1986-09-15
			73.	0629351	1986-09-30
			74.	0632340	1986-09-30
			75.	0638857	1986-08-31
			76.	0641038	1986-09-30
			77.	0642646	1986-09-30
			78.	0643951	1986-09-30
			79.	0644145	1986-09-30
			80.	0644246	1986-09-30
			81.	0645248	1986-10-15
			82.	0647353	1986-10-31
			83.	0649054	1986-08-31
			84.	0649256	1986-10-31

[No. CMD/13:1]

बी.एन. सिंह, अपर महासचिव

S.O. 377.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks Regulations) 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that 342 licences particulars of which are given in the following Schedule, have been renewed during the month of October, 1985 :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl No.	CM/L No.	Valid upto
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	0019526	1986-09-30
2.	0031718	1986-10-31
3.	0034926	1986-10-31
4.	0061626	1986-10-15
5.	0065331	1986-08-15
6.	0111211	1986-08-15
7.	0128228	1986-09-30
8.	0134021	1986-09-30
9.	0146230	1986-09-30
10.	0151728	1986-09-15
11.	0161327	1986-01-31
12.	0167440	1986-10-15
13.	0181030	1986-09-30
14.	0184137	1986-09-30
15.	0210451	1986-10-15
16.	0211013	1986-10-15
17.	0226228	1986-09-30
18.	0239338	1986-10-15
19.	0273335	1985-10-31
20.	0277245	1986-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
85.	0663149	1936-02-30	150.	0332372	1935-02-15
86.	0663270	1935-02-30	151.	0823169	1936-03-31
87.	0673348	1936-10-15	152.	0893277	1935-09-30
88.	0692257	1936-04-15	153.	0898333	1935-02-30
89.	0717951	1935-15-30	154.	0899178	1936-09-30
90.	0712944	1935-17-31	155.	0399431	1935-02-30
91.	0713138	1935-07-31	156.	0892582	1935-02-30
92.	0714039	1936-03-31	157.	0900743	1935-09-30
93.	0714140	1935-09-30	158.	0901038	1935-09-30
94.	0716346	1936-08-31	159.	0901139	1935-02-30
95.	0716549	1936-03-31	160.	0901644	1936-09-30
96.	0718754	1935-11-15	161.	0902949	1936-10-15
97.	0719759	1935-09-15	162.	0903042	1935-10-15
98.	0719251	1935-09-15	163.	0905753	1935-10-15
99.	0710539	1935-09-15	164.	0944359	1935-02-28
100.	0720741	1935-02-30	165.	0954365	1935-06-30
101.	0720943	1935-02-15	166.	0959375	1935-02-30
102.	0721137	1935-02-30	167.	0977576	1936-07-15
103.	0721945	1935-09-15	168.	0978275	1935-06-30
104.	0723141	1936-09-30	169.	0985272	1936-10-15
105.	0723444	1936-02-30	170.	0933076	1935-03-31
106.	0723545	1935-02-15	171.	0933935	1935-03-31
107.	0724143	1936-09-30	172.	0937078	1935-03-31
108.	0723656	1936-10-31	173.	0937070	1935-02-15
109.	0740949	1935-02-31	174.	0931772	1935-09-15
110.	0757360	1936-03-31	175.	0931271	1935-02-15
111.	0760147	1935-03-31	176.	0931071	1935-02-15
112.	0769266	1936-04-15	177.	0935275	1936-02-30
113.	0771156	1936-04-30	178.	0935477	1935-02-30
114.	0777770	1936-03-31	179.	0935579	1935-02-30
115.	0779673	1935-07-31	180.	0935975	1935-02-30
116.	0776964	1936-07-31	181.	0935333	1935-02-15
117.	0787773	1936-07-31	182.	0937077	1935-02-30
118.	0791865	1935-03-15	183.	0937178	1935-02-30
119.	0792169	1936-02-15	184.	0937079	1935-02-30
120.	0733751	1935-09-30	185.	0933130	1935-02-30
121.	0735566	1936-02-31	186.	0933332	1935-02-30
122.	0791164	1936-03-31	187.	0933736	1935-02-30
123.	0791871	1935-03-31	188.	0933131	1935-02-30
124.	0735166	1935-03-31	189.	0933182	1936-02-30
125.	0735373	1935-08-31	190.	0932485	1936-10-15
126.	0798172	1935-09-15	191.	0999687	1936-10-15
127.	0718273	1936-02-15	192.	1001815	1935-10-15
128.	0733475	1935-02-15	193.	1006421	1936-11-15
129.	0800840	1936-02-30	194.	1034426	1936-02-15
130.	0800341	1936-02-30	195.	1038333	1936-10-15
131.	0302036	1935-02-30	196.	1039739	1936-09-15
132.	0302541	1935-02-30	197.	1042122	1936-06-30
133.	0302542	1935-02-30	198.	1045734	1936-09-15
134.	0803341	1935-02-30	199.	1048336	1936-10-15
135.	0304141	1936-10-15	200.	1054028	1936-03-31
136.	0313243	1935-03-31	201.	1063433	1936-06-30
137.	0820038	1936-10-31	202.	1063837	1936-04-15
138.	0825151	1935-02-15	203.	1072232	1936-10-15
139.	0845862	1936-10-31	204.	1085342	1936-02-30
140.	0358164	1935-03-15	205.	1091438	1936-05-30
141.	0859974	1936-02-30	206.	0931339	1936-05-30
142.	0860757	1935-05-15	207.	104320	1936-08-15
143.	0864452	1935-02-30	208.	106528	1936-08-15
144.	0885470	1935-03-15	209.	107023	1936-07-31
145.	0385270	1935-03-15	210.	107427	1936-08-15
146.	0836371	1935-03-15	211.	108530	1936-08-31
147.	0337576	1935-03-15	212.	109936	1936-08-31
148.	0337777	1935-03-15	213.	110012	1936-08-31
149.	0388678	1936-03-15	214.	110113	1936-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
215.	1110719	1986-08-31	280.	1306130	1986-04-30
216.	1112016	1986-07-15	281.	1312428	1986-05-31
217.	1112117	1986-09-15	282.	1312529	1986-05-31
218.	1114222	1986-08-31	283.	1319745	1986-06-30
219.	1115325	1986-09-15	284.	1322835	1986-07-15
220.	1115931	1986-09-15	285.	1323736	1986-07-15
221.	1116428	1986-08-31	286.	1328029	1986-07-31
222.	1116529	1986-09-15	287.	1328948	1986-07-15
223.	1116731	1986-09-30	288.	1329142	1986-08-15
224.	1116933	1986-09-30	289.	1329243	1986-07-31
225.	1117632	1986-09-30	290.	1329647	1986-08-15
226.	1117834	1986-09-30	291.	1330228	1986-08-15
227.	1118634	1986-09-30	292.	1330329	1986-08-15
228.	1118735	1986-09-30	293.	1331028	1986-08-15
229.	1119838	1986-09-30	294.	1331129	1986-08-15
230.	1120015	1986-10-15	295.	1331220	1986-08-15
231.	1120116	1986-10-15	296.	1332535	1986-08-31
232.	1120419	1986-10-15	297.	1332838	1986-03-15
233.	1120924	1986-10-15	298.	1332939	1986-03-15
234.	1122019	1986-09-30	299.	1334135	1986-08-31
235.	1122423	1986-10-15	300.	1334236	1986-03-31
236.	1122726	1986-12-31	301.	1334337	1986-03-31
237.	1123920	1986-10-15	302.	1334438	1986-03-31
238.	1127534	1986-09-30	303.	1334539	1986-08-31
239.	1154537	1986-09-15	304.	1334741	1986-03-31
240.	1165037	1986-02-28	305.	1334842	1986-03-31
241.	1182239	1986-04-30	306.	1335036	1986-08-31
242.	1194751	1986-06-15	307.	1335238	1986-03-31
243.	1205023	1986-06-30	308.	1335541	1986-08-31
244.	1211119	1986-06-30	309.	1337242	1986-08-31
245.	1211422	1986-06-30	310.	1338042	1986-08-31
246.	1213426	1986-09-30	311.	1338345	1986-08-31
247.	1224229	1986-03-15	312.	1338446	1986-08-31
248.	1224330	1986-03-15	313.	1338648	1986-08-31
249.	1224431	1986-08-15	314.	1339044	1986-08-31
250.	1224532	1986-08-15	315.	1339145	1986-08-31
251.	1226334	1986-08-15	316.	1339549	1986-08-31
252.	1226536	1986-03-15	317.	1339953	1986-08-31
253.	1227336	1986-08-31	318.	1340130	1986-08-31
254.	1227841	1986-08-15	319.	1340433	1986-08-31
255.	1228742	1986-08-31	320.	1340635	1986-08-31
256.	1228843	1986-08-31	321.	1340736	1986-08-31
257.	1230325	1986-08-31	322.	1341334	1986-08-31
258.	1233230	1986-09-30	323.	1341033	1986-08-31
259.	1233735	1986-09-30	324.	1342336	1986-09-30
260.	1234636	1986-09-15	325.	1342437	1986-09-31
261.	1235133	1986-09-30	326.	1342740	1986-09-30
262.	1235234	1986-09-30	327.	1342841	1986-09-30
263.	1235335	1986-09-15	328.	1342942	1986-09-30
264.	1235638	1986-09-30	329.	1343045	1986-09-30
265.	1235739	1986-09-30	330.	1344138	1986-09-30
266.	1235941	1986-03-31	331.	1344239	1986-09-30
267.	1236640	1986-09-30	332.	1344441	1986-09-30
268.	1236741	1986-09-30	333.	1344946	1986-09-30
269.	1237743	1986-10-15	334.	1345544	1986-09-30
270.	1237945	1986-09-30	335.	1345948	1986-09-30
271.	1238644	1986-10-15	336.	1346243	1986-09-30
272.	1240429	1986-10-15	337.	1346445	1986-10-15
273.	1241027	1986-10-15	338.	1346849	1986-10-15
274.	1241128	1986-10-15	339.	1346950	1986-10-15
275.	1241936	1986-10-31	340.	1347144	1986-10-15
276.	1243536	1986-10-31	341.	1348247	1986-10-15
277.	1254339	1986-12-15	342.	1348449	1986-10-15
278.	1271137	1986-01-31			
279.	1302829	1986-04-15			

[No. CMD/13 : 12]

B.N. SINGH, Addl. Director General

उद्योग मंत्रालय
(सरकारी उद्यम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली 9, अक्टूबर, 1986

का. आ. 3798—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके 80% कर्मचारीबुद्ध ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

- (1) भारत पम्पस एण्ड कंप्रेसर्स लिमिटेड, नैनी, इलाहाबाद तथा इसके देहरादून, दिल्ली बम्बई और बड़ोदा स्थित क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय ।
- (2) बर्न स्टैंडर्ड कंपनी लिमिटेड, जबलपुर वर्क्स, जबलपुर (मध्य प्रदेश)
- (3) बर्न स्टैंडर्ड कंपनी लिमिटेड, निवार वर्क्स, निवार (मध्य प्रदेश) ।
- (4) रिचर्डसन एंड क्रुडस (1972) लिमिटेड, भायखड़ा आधारन वर्क्स सर जे जे रोड, बम्बई-400008.
- (5) हेवी इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन, धुर्वा, राखी-834004.
- (6) माफतो उद्योग लिमिटेड, गुडगांव (हरियाणा) ।
- (7) भारत हेवी इंजिनिरींग लिमिटेड, उद्योग क्षेत्र प्रभागा, लोधी रोड, नई दिल्ली-110003.

के. पी. सिंह, विशेष कार्य अधिकारी

[सं. ई-11012/2/85-हिन्दी]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY
(Department of Public Enterprises)
New Delhi, the 9th October, 1986

S.O. 3798.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following Offices, the 80 per cent staff whereof have acquired a working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. Bharat Pumps & Compressors Ltd., Naini, Allahabad and its regional offices located at Dehradun, Delhi, Bombay and Baroda.
2. Burn Standard Company Ltd., Jabalpur Works, Jabalpur (M.P.).
3. Burn Standard Company Ltd., Niwar Works, Niwar (M.P.).
4. Richardson & Cruddas (1972) Ltd., Byculia Iron Works, Sir J. J. Road, Bombay-400008.
5. Heavy Engineering Corporation, Dhurwa, Ranchi-834004.
6. Maruti Udyog Limited, Gurgaon (Haryana).
7. Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., Industry Sector Division, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.

[No. E-11012(2)/85-Hindi]

K. P. SINGH, Officer on Special Duty.

(रसायन एवं पेट्रो रसायन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर 1986

का. आ. 3799.—सार्वजनिक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोक्ताओं की बखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) के खंड 3 द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एवम् द्वारा निम्न तालिका के स्तम्भ 1 में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के समतुल्य अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के उद्देश्यों के लिए संघ

अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है जो अपने क्षेत्र की सीमाओं में उक्त तालिका के स्तम्भ (2) में निश्चित सार्वजनिक परिसर के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा प्रयुक्त उनके अन्तर्गत संस्था अधिकारियों को प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और सौंपे गये उत्तरदायित्वों को निभावेगा, धन्यः—

तालिका

अधिकारी का पदनाम सार्वजनिक परिसरों की श्रेणियां तथा क्षेत्र-
धिकार की स्थानीय सीमाएं

(1)

(2)

कंपनी सचिव, बंगाल कैमि- बम्बई तथा कलकत्ता में बंगाल कैमिकल्स एंड
कल्स एंड फार्मस्यूटिकल्स लि. फार्मस्यूटिकल्स लि. के तथा उनके द्वारा
कलकत्ता प्रयुक्त उनकी और से पट्टे पर लिये गये
सभी परिसर

[सं. 31(17)/86-के 5]

आई. एस. कोहली, अधीक्षक सचिव

(Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals)

New Delhi, the 15th October, 1986

S.O. 3799.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of a gazetted officer of Government, to be the estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise of the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under the said Act within the limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table namely :—

TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)

Company Secretary, Bengal Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Limited, Calcutta	All premises belonging to or taken on lease at Bombay and Calcutta, by or on behalf of the Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceuticals Limited.
---	---

[No. 31 (17)/86-DV]

I. S. KOHLI, Under Secy.

परिवहन मंत्रालय

(जन-भूतल परिवहन विभाग)

(नौवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 23 अक्टूबर 1986

का. आ. 2800.—केन्द्र सरकार, केन्द्रीय दीपचर सलाहकार समिति (प्रक्रियात्मक) नियम, 1976 के नियम 7 के साथ पठित दीपचर अधिनियम, 1927 (1927 का 17) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) के अनुवचन में लोक सभा सदस्य श्री आर. एन. माने को केन्द्रीय दीपचर सलाहकार समिति का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और परिवहन मंत्रालय, जन-भूतल परिवहन विभाग (नौवहन पक्ष) में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना

सं. का. भा. 1838, दिनांक 11 अप्रैल, 1986 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में मद सं. 6 और उम्मेद संबंधित प्रविष्टि के लिए निम्नलिखित मद और प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“6. श्री आर. एस. माने, सदस्य, लोक सभा।”

[सं. एत. डब्ल्यू/एन.एन.ई-15/85-ए.एन]

डा. ड. सूद, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT
(Department of Surface Transport)

(Shipping Wing)

New Delhi, the 23rd October, 1986

S.O. 3800.—In pursuance of subsection (1) of section 4 of the Lighthouse Act, 1927 (17 of 1927) read with rule 7 of the Central Advisory Committee for Lighthouses (Procedural) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. S. Mane, Member of Lok Sabha as Member of the Central Advisory Committee for Lighthouses and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport Department of Surface Transport (Shipping Wing) No. S.O. 1833, dated the 11th April, 1986, namely:—

In the said notification for item No. 6 and the entry relating thereto, the following item and entry shall be substituted namely:

“6. Shri R. S. Mane, Member, Lok Sabha”.

[No. SW/LLE-15/85-SL]

D. D. SOOD, Under Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

न दिनांक 8 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. भा. 3801:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 4) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 9-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

MINISTRY OF LABOUR
New Delhi, the 23rd October, 1986

S.O. 3801.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Union Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1986.

**BEFORE SRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR**

Industrial Dispute No. 17/86

Reference No. L-12011/42/85-D.II(A) dated 22-1-86

In the matter of dispute between:

The Secretary, Union Bank Employees Union, C/o
120/459 Lajpat Nagar, Kanpur.

AND

The Regional Manager, Union Bank of India, Regional
Office Pandu Nagar, Kanpur.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-12011/4285-D.II(A) dated 22-1-86 has referred the following dispute for adjudication on this tribunal:

1. “Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India in denying the special allowance carrying post of Daftary to senior most persons Shri Ganga Prasad and Shri Syed Nazoor with effect from 28th and 29th September, 1984 respectively at

their two newly opened branches is fair and justified? If not, to what relief they are entitled?”

2. “Whether the action of management of Union Bank of India in denying the special allowance carrying post of the cash peons to senior-most persons Shri Shiv Singh and Shri Badloo Prasad with effect from 28th and 29th September, 1984 respectively at their two newly opened branches is fair and justified? If no, to what relief the workman are entitled to?”

2. The workman submitted his claim statement and the later stage the workman representative states that workman has not to proceed with the case and does not press the application.

ORDER

Let no claim award be sent to the Government.

Let the six copies of the award be sent to the Government for its publication.

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12011/42/85-D.II(A)]

का. भा. 3802:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 9-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3802.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Union Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1986.

**BEFORE SRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,**

KANPUR

Industrial Dispute Nos. 194/81, and 100/83

In the matter of dispute between:

Workmen: 1. Shri P. N. Shukla, 2. Shri K. K. Bajpai,
Both C/o Shri Harmangal Prasad 36/1. Kailash
Mandir, Shivala, Kanpur-208001.

Industry: M/s. Union Bank of India, Hotel Clarks
Awadh, Lucknow.

APPEARANCES:

Shri Harmangal Prasad—for the workmen.

Shri Satpal—for the Management.

AWARD

1. The Central Government Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-12012/1/81, D.II(A) dt. 19-12-1981 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal for adjudication:

Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India in debarring Shri P. N. Shukla, Special Assistant from promotion for three years w.e.f. 14-8-80 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

2. Further the Central Government vide its notification no. L-12012/33/81/D.II(A) dt. 30-1-82 has referred the following dispute for adjudication:

Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Union Bank of India, Lucknow in debarring Shri K. K. Bajpai, Assistant Special from promotion for three years is justified, if not, to what if any, is the workman concerned entitled?

3. On the request of the parties the above noted two industrial disputes were consolidated and I.D. No. 194/81 was made leading case wherein all evidences have been adduced.

4. The two cases related to debarring the workman of the two references from being posted as special assistant for a period of three years. Both the parties filed their respective claims and documents the management gave affidavit evidence of Shri S. L. Verma but the workman Shri P. N. Shukla only gave his affidavit evidence in the case and both the witnesses of the parties have appeared in the witness box for cross examination.

5. As no one appeared on behalf of the workman to cross examine the management witness and to substantiate his stand, an ex parte award dt. 31-10-1985 against the workman was given and sent to the Government for publication.

6. Meanwhile the workman moved an application on that very day for recalling the order to proceed ex parte and as the application was made within time i.e. before publication and finality of the award and as sufficient cause was given therein, the order to proceed ex parte was recalled on 2-12-85, and as management affidavit was already there, the date for cross examination of the management witness was fixed.

7. The whole dispute is whether the two workmen namely Shri P.N. Shukla and Sh. K.K. Bajpai were served with the promotion order to officiate as special assistant was refused by them which entailed penal consequences of debarring from promotion for 3 years in view of the promotion agreement of 1975 as amended upto September 1980 Annexure M-1 on record. Admittedly the two officials working as clerk in the management bank. According to the management workmen Sh. P.N. Shukla was served with the promotion order dt. 12-8-80 which he refused to accept and acknowledge the same, consequently on 14-8-80 the same was sought to be served upon him in presence of Sh. V.K. Agarwal and A.K. Agrawal by the branch manager. Admittedly a vacancy occurred at Sarvodaya Nagar Branch, Kanpur of the management bank in August, 80 for which under instructions from the Regional Manager's Office, Kanpur, the workman was deputed to Sarvodaya Nagar, Kanpur, (Branch) as Officer Gr. I temporary and was to be relieved so as to join Sarvodaya Nagar branch next day i.e. 13-8-80, but the contention of the workman in the absence of any written posting order he refused to report at Sarvodaya Nagar Branch of the management at Kanpur, the management thereafter, debarrd the workman from further promotion in view of para 6.4 of the promotion agreement, the management debarrd the at local stations or same stations also which amounted to victimisation under promotion agreement of 1975 annexure M-1 para 6.4 reads as follows;

If an employee refused to accept a higher appointment in the same cadre on a promotion to the higher cadre offered strictly in terms of these rules, at the station where he is working he shall forfeit his claim for such Higher appointment promotion for a period of 3 years from the date of such refusal. Refusal to accept a higher appointment promotion at any other station in the same state will bar him for such higher appointment promotion for a period of two years. Such employees will not be eligible even to work in higher posts in the same cadre on temporary assignment or to officiate in a higher posts in the same cadre during the period of the bar. For the purpose, the offer of appointment to a higher post/promotion to higher cadre should be in writing to the employee concerned and the refusal thereon should also be in writing.

8. The case of workman Shri K.K. Bajpai is that he worked as officer Grade II since May 80 in leave vacancy and as when it occurred at Sirhana Road Branch he was posted, when a temporary vacancy of officer Gr. II occurred at September 80, the branch manager Sirhana Road vide memo dt. 12-9-80 intimated the workman that under the instruction of the Regional Manager's office, the workman was deputed at Sarvodaya Nagar Branch to officiate as officer Gr. II temporary, but he was consequently ordered to be relieved with instruction to report at Sarvodaya Nagar branch on 13th September, 1980. According to the workman he had not received the order of his posting as officer Gr. II at Sarvodaya Nagar Branch and it was in the absence of any written posting order that the workman refused to work at Sarvodaya Nagar Kanpur. It is averred that the order of

12-9-80 was sought to be served on the workman on 15-9-80 and on assumed refusal he was debarred from promotion for three years from 15-9-80 relying upon para 6.4 of the mutual agreement dt. 22-10-75. The management consequently debarrd the workman K.K. Bajpai even from local officiating chances and that too at the same station which amounted to victimisation. The workman has assised the agreement that it is binding only on the union concerned and not on the petitioners union which was not a party. It is averred that circular 18D dt. 29-6-76 is unreasonable as it equates permanent posting with temporary posting even for a period less than a weeks duration. It has been consequently prayed the action of the management be adjudged as illegal and not justified.

9. The management in its written statement averred that in view of the management's letter dt. 12-9-80 the workman concerned was offered temporary officiation as officer grade II junior management grade I at Sarvodaya Nagar Branch Kanpur and the workman Shri K.K. Bajpai vide his letter dt. 15-9-80 refused to officiate in the officer cadre and in view of all these and in terms of para 6.4 of the promotion agreement the workman was debarrd for three years. The other averments of the workman were denied.

10. On behalf of the management Shri. S.L. Verma personnel officer gave his evidence on affidavit. Management has filed letter of the workman dt. 15-9-80 whereby he refused to go to Sarvodaya Nagar Branch on promotion on the plea that his union had made representation regarding wrongful criteria of officiation at Kanpur on 18-8-80 and till reply of that representation is received he was not willing to go on promotion.

11. The promotion agreement para 6.4 between the union and management was circular as staff circular no. 1817 dt. 29-6-76. It is being followed since then and is for the benefits of the workman as such even if it is entered into by management not with the union sponsoring the workman's case the workman of the banking industry are bound by it. I have already quoted above clause 6.4 of the promotion agreement and it relates even staffs to temporary assignment carrying special allowances and officiation, Shri K.K. Bajpai refuse's promotion vide his letter dt. 15-9-80 in the garb that his union has made some representation and he will not leave till the same is replied. There terms amounts to refusal to go on promotion. In the case of Shri P. N. Shukla he has no where admitted in writing that he will not go on promotion rather taken the plea that the order of promotion in writing dt. 12-8-80 was never served on him it was on that account that the management took the precaution of serving the same on 14-8-80 before two witnesses namely Shri V. K. Agarwal and Shri A. K. Agarwal. Management has filed annexure M-3 showing that the memo for promotion dt. 12-8-80 was sought to be served on the workman on 14-8-80 which he refused to accept before the two witnesses of the management named above before the Assistant Branch Manager who has signed the note of refusal annexure M-3 and copies of the same was sent to the Regional Manager and other officers at Lucknow and Bombay.

12. Management gave affidavit evidence of personnel officer who substantiated the stand of the management as per records and also filed affidavit evidence of Shri K. G. Kapoor the then Branch Manager at Agra who gave his evidence on his personal knowledge. During the pendency of the case Shri K. G. Kapoor retired and the management could not produce him for cross examination consequently another affidavit of Shri S. C. Bajpai was given and he has testified that he was working as Assistant Branch Manager at the relevant time of the main branch Kanpur and it was on 14-8-80 that memo dt. 12-8-80 was sought to be served on the workman Shri P. N. Shukla who refuse to accept the same before Shri V. K. Agarwal and Shri A. K. Agarwal as consequence of which he prepared a refusal note on 14-8-80 which he himself signed and two other witnesses namely Shri V. K. Agarwal and A. K. Agarwal. He has filed and prepared the same as MW 2/1. In cross examination Shri S. L. Verma has deposed to a court question that debarring the workman was not the punishment but in accordance with the promotion agreement which provides that if an employee refuses to officiate in temporary capacity he can be debarrd for pro-

motion for three years. He has denied the suggestion that no promotion order was given to the workman or served upon him. The workman wanted to ask question whether non-compliance of orders of superiors was a misconduct but the question was disallowed as the management has not based his case on misconduct. There was no question of taking disciplinary action against the workman as whatever was done in pursuance of para 6.4 of the promotion agreement.

13. He has denied the workman suggestion that the workman was officiating as officer grade II from May 80 to January, 1981. He however, admitted that the branch manager inadvertently made over payment for officiation as officer grade II to the workman but when this fact came to the notice of the higher authorities of the management, the same was recovered.

14. The other management witness is Shri S. C. Bajpai who has tendered his affidavit on 9-4-86 as evidence. He has deposed that the workman was special assistant at Birhana Road Branch when he was there as AEM. He admitted that it was practice that special assistants officiated as officer grade II in leave vacancies. He has further stated that he had himself presented the memorandum to the workman who refused to accept it before the two witnesses of the management named above.

15. On the other hand the workman P. N. Shukla had appeared in the witness box and had given his affidavit. He had in cross examination admitted that no letter was given to him for performing officiating duty from May 80 to January, 1981 and as per practice prevailing in the bank verbal instructions were given to him and he did not object to that. He has denied that any memo dt. 12-8-80 was issued to him asking him that he was being relieved to report to Branch Manager Sarvodaya Nagar, Kanpur, the next day. When shown Annexure M-1 the workman denies that this document was ever served on him. He further states that on 14-8-80 no another letter alongwith letter M-2 dt. 12-8-80 was given to him which he refused to accept before Shri V. K. Agarwal and Shri A. K. Agarwal and stated that he had no knowledge about relieving order dt. 12-8-80 or 14-8-80.

16. In view of the firm testimony of Shri S. C. Bajpai alongwith document annexure M-2 of his affidavit, I am not inclined to believe his testimony rather disbelieve the workman on the point and believe Shri S. C. Bajpai whose stand is supported by document.

17. I consequently hold that the two workmen were rightly debarred from promotion for three years to the officer grade II in view of provision of para 6.4 of the promotion agreement referred above.

18. I, therefore give my award accordingly in I.D. No. 100/84 holding that the action of the management debarring the workman from promotion for three years w.e.f. 14-8-80 is justified. I further give my award in I.D. No. 194 of 83 holding that the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Lucknow in debarring the workman from promotion for three years is justified.

19. The result is that the two workmen are not entitled to get any relief as prayed for.

20. Award is given accordingly and let a copy of this award be placed on the record of file no. 100/83 K. K. Bajpai Vs. Union Bank of India. It is further ordered that let six copies of this award be sent to the government for its publication.

Dated: 6-10-86.

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/1/81-D.II(A)]

का. अ. 3803—प्रौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार कोऑपरेटिव बैंक आक अहमदाबाद लिमिटेड के प्रबंधक में सम्बद्ध निजीकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट प्रौद्योगिक विवाद में प्रौद्योगिक अधिकरण अहमदाबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3803.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad as shown in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Co-Operative Bank of Ahmedabad Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. BAROT, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 3 of 1980
ADJUDICATION
BETWEEN

Co-operative Bank of Ahmedabad Ltd.,
Sahakar Bhavan, Abad Chambers Relief Road,
Ahmedabad-380 001 ... First party.

AND

Shri Arvindkumar B. Patel
11/B, Saurashtra Patel Society
Bhiddhajan Hanuman Road,
Near Bapunagar,
Ahmedabad-380 018. ... Second party.

In the matter of whether the Cooperative Bank of India Ltd., Ahmedabad is justified in terminating the services of Shri A. B. Patel, Peon w.e.f. 1st December, 1976.

APPEARANCES

Shri B. N. Joshi, Advocate—for the first party.
Shri Y. V. Shah, Advocate—for the second party.

STATE : Gujarat INDUSTRY : Banking Ahmedabad.
AWARD PART II (FINAL)

This is a reference made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, constituting Shri R. C. Israni as Presiding Officer of the Industrial Tribunal with headquarters at Ahmedabad, in exercise of the powers conferred by S. 7A and Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The reference is made by the Central Government Order No. L-12012/13/79-I.I.A. Dated 7-4-1980. The dispute which is referred for adjudication as stated in the Schedule to the order of reference is as under :

"Whether the Cooperative Bank of India Ltd., Ahmedabad, is justified in terminating the services of Shri A. B. Patel, Peon with effect from 1st December, 1976 ? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?"

The said dispute has come to be transferred to me by appropriate orders issued by the Government in this behalf.

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are : Shri Arvind Kumar B. Patel, (briefly, 'the workman concerned') Peon of the Bank is alleged to have abused the Cashier, Shri Bhagwandas on 6-5-1976 with regard to some work entrusted to him. A Show Cause Notice was given to him. Subsequently a departmental inquiry was held as a result of which his services were terminated. Finally this reference has come to be made to this Tribunal.

3. Initially Shri L. A. Dodia, learned Advocate appeared for the Bank who retired after Award Part-I was delivered and now Shri B. M. Joshi, learned Advocate represents the Bank. Shri Y. V. Shah, learned Advocate represents Shri Patel, the concerned workman. During the course of arguments Shri Y. V. Shah, the learned Advocate for Shri Patel had argued that in the domestic inquiry held by the Bank, principles of natural justice were not followed in as much as Shri Patel was not furnished, though asked, the copy of the complaint of Shri Bhagwandas; Shri Patel was not allowed to engage a friend in conducting the inquiry; he was not allowed to cross-examine; he was not furnished a copy of the finding of the inquiry officer and on these grounds Shri Shah, learned Advocate for Shri Patel argued that since principles of natural justice were not followed

while conducting the domestic inquiry, it should be held to be void and Shri Patel should be reinstated with full back wages. After hearing the arguments of parties, this Tribunal passed Award Part-I holding that the domestic inquiry held against Shri Patel suffers from certain infirmities, and principles of natural justice were not followed and as such the inquiry is illegal and void. Since the employer-bank had asked for permission to prove the misconduct alleged before the Tribunal, the Bank was given an opportunity to prove the misconduct of Shri Patel before the Tribunal by leading evidence.

4. As directed in Award Part-I, for proving the misconduct Shri B. M. Joshi, learned Advocate for the Bank has examined Shri Bhagwandas Nagindas the Cashier at Ex. 69, Shri Bhimjibhai the Peon at Ex. 71, Shri Hasmukhbhai Rasiklal, Clerk at Ex. 72 and Shri Govindbhai Chimanbhai, Dy. Manager at Ex. 73 on behalf of the Bank. Shri Shah, learned Advocate for Shri Patel has examined Shri Arvindbhai Bhimjibhai, the concerned workman at Ex. 75. This is all the oral evidence led in the case.

5. Shri Bhagwandas has in his deposition Ex. 69 has reiterated what had happened on 6-5-1976, viz., the Peon, Shri Patel had given abuses, that he had not used indecent language and the proceedings that followed. In the cross-examination except one contradiction, viz. about the complaint made by him which is either oral or written, the learned Advocate, Shri Shah for Shri Patel has not been able to knock out anything more in his cross-examination. The Peon, Shri Bhimjibhai at Ex. 71 a witness for the Bank has also stated that Shri Patel had given abuses to Shri Bhagwandas; Shri Bhagwandas had not given abuses to Shri Patel. In his cross examination, nothing has come out which would help Shri Patel. Another witness for the Bank Shri Hasmukhbhai Rasiklal, a Clerk has been examined at Ex. 72. He has stated that he was not an eye witness to the incident. In his cross examination, nothing has been brought out to help Shri Patel. The third witness for the Bank is the Dy. Manager, Shri Govindbhai Chimanbhai at Ex. 73. He has not referred to the incident in question in his chief and so also in his cross examination. Shri Arvindbhai Bhimjibhai Patel, the concerned workman has stepped in the witness box and given his evidence at Ex. 75. He has denied to have committed any misconduct. In his cross examination he stated that he was forced to use indecent language because of the persistent indecent language used by Shri Bhagwandas. No other witness has been examined by Shri Patel to support his case.

6. Reading the evidence of both the parties as a whole, I am inclined to believe the say of the Bank that the concerned Peon, Shri Patel had used abusive language during the working hours of the Bank in the Bank premises before the staff members and general public during the course of discharge of his duties, which is certainly a misconduct and such misconduct cannot be allowed to go unpunished. It is pertinent to note that except this incident his past record appears to be clean.

7. After having come to this conclusion, the next question that arises is what punishment should be inflicted.

8. Shri Y. V. Shah, learned Advocate for the concerned Peon Shri Patel has argued that even if it is presumed that Shri Patel has used indecent language, it is not such a grave misconduct as to justify his dismissal from service. He has referred the case of *Rana Kant Misra Vs. State of U.P.* & others reported in AIR 1982 S.C. 1552 wherein it is held in para 8 at p. 1555 as under :

“... and indiscrete, improper, abusive language may show lack of culture but merely the use of such language on one occasion unconnected with any subsequent positive action and not preceded by any blameworthy conduct cannot merit an extreme penalty of dismissal from service”.

The Supreme Court in the above case on the facts and circumstances of the said case had ordered reinstatement with all benefits including the back wages, but only his two increments falling due from the date of his termination of service had been withheld with future effect.

9. Another case relied upon by Shri Shah is the case of *Shri Ved Prakash Gupta Vs. M/s. Delton Cable India (P)*

Ltd. reported in AIR 1984 S.C. 914 wherein the appellant abused Durg Singh and S. K. Bagga in filthy language, and the Supreme Court held as under :

“We are therefore of the opinion that the punishment awarded to the appellant is shockingly disproportionate regard being had to the charge framed against him”.

The Supreme Court in the above case reinstated the appellant with full back wages including continuity of service. It is pertinent here to note that the appellant in this case had abused Durg Singh who was the Secretary of a rival labour union. The Supreme Court in this case observed :—

“We are also of the opinion that no responsible employer would ever impose in like circumstances the punishment of dismissal to the employee and that victimization or unfair labour practice could well be inferred from the conduct of the management in awarding the extreme punishment of dismissal for a flimsy charge of abuse of some worker or officer of the management by the appellant within the premises of the Factory”.

In the present case it has not been established that Shri Patel was an office bearer or an active worker of the union and that he has been victimized for his trade union activities.

10. Shri Shah has also referred to a case of *C. V. Kotesha Vs. Halar Salt & Chemical Works* reported in G.L.R. Vol. XXVI (1) : 1985 (1) p. 146 wherein Hon'ble the Gujarat High Court has held as under (p. 148) :

“No responsible employer acting reasonably can say that for a misconduct of uttering abuses to the Manager, should result into extreme penalty of dismissal as if such misconduct is the highest form of severe misconduct. Persons belonging to comparatively poorer and backward strata of society may not have the same sense of sophistication in expressing their outburst but that does not deserve the punishment of losing the service. The termination of service cannot, under any circumstances, be justified in the present case. The punishment is certainly and grossly disproportionate to the charge against the petitioner workman and, therefore, the order of dismissal and termination of services of the petitioner workman must be quashed and set aside”.

The High Court, looking to the facts & circumstances of the case ordered reinstatement with 50 per cent of the back wages. The workman in the above case had talked rudely to the Manager of the Co. in connection with accidental injury to the brother of the petitioner.

11. As against this, Shri Joshi, learned Advocate for the Bank has relied on a case of *Madras High Court between Ganeshar Aluminium Factory Co. Teevanlal (1979) 144 V.L.J. Industrial Tribunal Madras & another* reported in 1982 (45) F.I.R. p. 68. Relevant head notes read as under :

“There could be no doubt that even in a case where the Tribunal agrees with the management that the misconduct is proved, it may award a lesser punishment if it is of the opinion that the proved misconduct does not merit punishment by way of discharge or dismissal”.

Madras High Court in the above case, looking to the facts and circumstances of the case ordered reinstatement without back wages. Relying on this indiment, Shri Joshi, argued that in any case even if the Tribunal finds that the punishment awarded by the Bank to the concerned workman is severe, the Tribunal should not order back wages.

12. Shri Joshi for the Bank has further relied on a decision given by Madhya Pradesh High Court in *Bahulal Sharma Vs. M.P. Electricity Board Jabalpur & others* reported in 1948 (49) F.I.R. p. 267 and argued that in similar situation the M.P. High Court has also ordered reinstatement without back wages and accordingly this Tribunal also if it finds that the punishment meted out to the workman is severe, should not order back wages.

13. I have gone through very carefully and in detail the various citations quoted by the parties. The essence of the judgments cited is that (1) the Tribunal has to judge for itself whether the alleged misconduct is proved on the basis of the evidence led in the case; and (2) what should be proper punishment in a given case, weighing properly the facts and circumstances of the case, if it finds that the alleged misconduct is proved. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, I think that the ends of justice would be met if the workman concerned is reinstated on his original post with continuity of service, but with only 50 per cent of back wages. It has to be remembered that the workman concerned was a Peon in a commercial bank. He had abused the Cashier when the Cashier had showed him some official work which he was supposed to do. The incident had taken place during the working hours when several customers were present in the bank for business. The behaviour of the Peon i.e. the workman concerned is certainly rude or most indecent. It is the case of the workman that it was the Cashier who had abused him and that he only retaliated in the manner in which he was abused. From this, it clearly appears that the workman concerned here the Peon did abuse the Cashier. As against that except the bare statement of the workman concerned that he was abused it is not supported by any of the witnesses examined before this Tribunal. On the contrary, it has come on record that it was the workman concerned who had abused the Cashier. In the circumstances aforesaid, I am of the view that this is not a fit case for giving reinstatement with full back wages, but as stated above, it would be just and proper to give reinstatement only with 50 per cent of back wages. I, therefore, pass the following order :

ORDER

14. The order passed by the Bank dated 29-11-1976 dismissing Shri Arvindkumar B. Patel, the workman concerned, from service is hereby set aside. The Bank is directed to reinstate the workman concerned with 50 per cent of back wages and continuity of service from the date of dismissal till the date of reinstatement. No order as to costs.

Ahmedabad

G. S. BAROT, Presiding Officer.
[No. I-12012/13/79-D-II(A)]

Dt. 2-9-86.

का. अ. 3804—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, संयुक्त बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधक से सम्बन्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-10-86 का प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3804.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the Central Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 247/85.

Reference No. L-12012/247/84, D-II(A) dt. 20-5-85.

In the matter of dispute between;

Workman.—Shri Amar Singh C/o Shri S. K. Kapoor
Divisional Secretary, Central Bank of India Karamchari Association, Kapoor Gall, Kapoor Bazar,
Near SBI Amroha District, Muradabad.

Management.—The Chief Manager, Central Bank of India, Bareilly.

STATE :

UTTAR PRADESH

APPEARANCE :

Shri O. P. Nigam—for the workman.

Shri A. K. Saxena—for the Management.

1012 GI/86—9.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its Notification No. L-12012/247/84-D, II(a), dt. 20th May, 1985, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal;

"Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, Bareilly in terminating the services of Shri Amar Singh sub-staff with effect from 11-1-1983 is justified? If not to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

And the government subsequently vide corrigendum referred the following dispute for adjudication;

"Whether the action of the C.B.I. in relation of its Bareilly branch Amar Singh Asstt. Cashier w.e.f. 11-1-1973 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

This reference has obviously been made after 12 years of workman's termination.

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed as Assistant Cashier temporarily in the year 1971 and continued to work as such upto 1972 and in this way he served the management bank in different branches for more than 240 days with some artificial breaks but he was not taken in banks services though so many employees who had served for more than 240 days had already been absorbed permanently. The management had been making request for his absorption but to no avail. According to the workman the date of termination is 16-11-73 and that during the period 18-11-71 to 16-11-72, the workman had worked for about 255 days for which he drew excluding sundays and holidays. It is further averred therein that no appointment or termination letter was issued and no notice or notice pay was given to him. He has consequently prayed that the termination be adjudged illegal and void and the workman be reinstated with full back wages on permanent basis.

3. The management has contested the application on the ground that the workman was appointed as Assistant Cashier cum Godown Keeper purely on temporary basis during leave arrangement at management's different branches during the period 71 to 73. He has raised the dispute long after his termination on 11-1-73 and hence in view of the law laid down by Supreme Court the same should be thrown out as belated. Management however, admits that the workman actually worked for 201 days in leave vacancies during period 71 to 73 and it was wrong to say that he worked for 253 days as alleged. Management however admits that no appointment or termination letter was issued to the workman as his services were utilised purely on temporary basis as per exigencies of the bank. That the workman never completed continuous service of 240 days during 12 calendar months. Management has given details of work done for 201 days at its different branches by workman, including work at Sitapur, Bareilly, Chauraha Gali Gorakhpur and Varanasi and have consequently prayed that the reference be answered in negative.

4. On 16-4-86 parties representative Shri S. P. Trivedi for the management and Shri O. P. Nigam for the workman stated that the photo copy of the document filed by the parties be read as evidence without formal proof. The workman has filed photo copy of the letter of the branch manager dt. 3-2-82 Ext. D-1 that on the basis of Amroha Branch Letter 27-1-1982, that the records of 1971-72 were not available as the same had been destroyed and since August 72 and onwards Shri Amar Singh had not worked at Gorakhpur Branch as Assistant Cashier or Godown Keeper, another certificate of the management relates to Chaurahagali Muradabad dt. 28-1-82 shows that the workman worked there for the period 3-6-72 to 18-7-72 total 36 days. Another certificate of Bareilly Ext. D-3 shows that for period 1-8-72 to 16-11-72, the workman worked for 95 days in that branch during broken period. The workman has given affidavit evidence that he has worked at Sitapur from 18-11-71 to 22-12-71 total 35 days in two spells without break but he has not summoned any record of Sitapur or filed any document to substantiate having worked therein in

this period. The workman has further averred in his affidavit that he worked at Gorakhpur from 24-12-71 to 31-12-71 and again from 25-2-72 to 15-4-72 total 90 days, regarding this working also there is no authentic document on record nor he summoned any of them except Ext. D-1. If his contention is allowed to prevail then taking the admitted position of work at Moradabad and Bareilly the workman can be said to have worked for more than 240 days in one calendar year backward from 16-11-72.

5. Workman himself admitted in cross examination that at present he has no document of proof of having worked at Gorakhpur. In his affidavit the workman has relied on the order of ALC in conciliation proceedings Ext. W-6 in which he has shown that the workman worked at Gorakhpur from 24-12-71 to 21-1-72 and again from 25-2-72 to 15-4-72 in two spells total 82 days. This period of working is not admitted by the management in their written statement or affidavit. In the absence of any cogent proof by summoning and filing documents the report of the conciliation officer can not be accepted as evidence. In his report he has referred the enquiries of the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central) Gorakhpur, the workman should have summoned the documents of the Gorakhpur where from the LEO Central came to the conclusion that the workman had worked for 45 days. In the absence of the same the report can not be accepted as basis for holding that he worked 45 days at Gorakhpur as reported by Labour Enforcement Officer (Central). No inference can be drawn from the letter of the Chief Manager dt. 11-8-83 Ext. D-5 in which he simply observed that claim for having worked for 253 days is spread over 2 years i.e. 71 and 72. This does not mean that the management has admitted that the workman worked for 240 days during one span of year counting backward in some date in 1972 to the corresponding date in 1971. The workman should have summoned documents from Sitapur also to show that actually he worked for 35 days during 18-11-71 to 22-12-71. In ext. D-1 filed by the workman branch manager Gorakhpur intimated to the manager Moradabad branch that records of 71 and 72 of the bank have been destroyed and that since August, 1972 and onward Shri Amar Singh had not worked in the management bank, this letter is dt. 3-2-82. This statement regarding non working of Shri Amar Singh after 1972 appears to be wrong as the management in the affidavit as well as in written statement admitted that the workman worked at Gorakhpur Branch from 27-11- to 26-11 and again from 27-11- to 11-1-1973. Thus even if it is conceded that the workman's contention is correct that he had worked at Gorakhpur from 24-12-71 to 15-4-71 total 90 days even that will not go to show that he had completed 240 days in one spell counting from 16-11-72 backward till 18-11-71. This could be possible only had the workman summoned the records of Sitapur where he has averred that he worked for 35 days, thus in the absence of any record to that effect it cannot be said that he worked for 240 days the workman has been paid for sundays and holidays falling in between dates admitted by the management and the number of days have been correctly counted.

6. Thus in any view of the matter it cannot be said that the workman has completed 240 days in one span of year in the absence of any cogent proof that he worked at Sitapur during the period 18-11-71 to 22-12-71, despite admitting that workman did work at Gorakhpur from 24-12-71 to 15-4-72 as records for that period have been weeded out. Thus the workman would not be entitled to benefit of 240 days and thus for regular employment as given in the case of other workman. However, management witness has admitted that no termination notice was given to the workman. As no notice for termination was given that the workman was ceased to work. As no notice for termination was given to the workman as required under para 522(4) of the Satri Award, the termination of the services of the workman would be illegal only on that count, the question that it will not amount to retrenchment on the ground of non renewal of contract of employment, the same being in employment in leave vacancy and on the expiry of such contract termination stipulated therein coming to effect would not apply as amendment of retrenchment was amended w.e.f. 18-8-84.

7. In these circumstances, the termination of the workman w.e.f. 11-1-1973 is not justified. The result is that he

will be entitled to be reinstated in service with full back-wages.

8. I, therefore, give my award accordingly.

Let six copies of this award be sent to the Govt. for publication.

Dt : 9-10-86.

[No. I-12012/247/84-D. II(A)]
R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

का. आ० 3805—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केंद्रीय सरकार, यूनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके पदोंधारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केंद्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट की प्रकाशित करती है, जो केंद्रीय सरकार का 14-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3805.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the United Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BHUBANESWAR

Industrial Dispute Case No. 4 of 1983 (Central)
Bhubaneswar, the 30th September, 1986

BETWEEN

The employers in relation to the management

United Bank of India, Rourkela. —First-party.

AND

Their workmen

—Second-party.

APPEARANCES:

Shri B. C. Tola, Officer—for the first-party.

Shri G. C. Dash, Regional Secretary,

Orissa Regional Committee

of Karamchari Samity.

—For the second-party

AWARD

This is a reference under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 made by the Government of India vide Notification No. L-12012/301/82. D. II (A) dated 30-7-1983 of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour. The schedule of reference is as follows:—

"Whether the demand of the workman Sri U. K. Pandey, Subordinate Staff, Rourkela Branch of the United Bank of India for payment of cash peon's allowance for the period from 4-7-77 to 4-2-80 (barring the period from 13-8-77 to 30-9-77) is justified? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. The case of the workman is that he joined in a permanent post on 23-1-1976 as a Peon in the Small Business Development Office, Bhubaneswar, which was subsequently converted to Branch Office of the United Bank of India, Saheednagar. During that period one G. C. Bindhani was working as a Cash Peon in the Rourkela Branch. As per the provisions of optional transfer of the Bank, the workman and Shri G. C. Bindhani had tendered their choice to go on transfer to the Rourkela Branch and Kuliana Branch respectively. Accordingly, the management passed orders of transfer. The management directed the Agent, Rourkela Branch to relieve Sri G. C. Bindhani and accept the joining order of the workman in his place. In pursuance of the said order both of them were relieved by their respective branch authorities at the close of the business on 2-7-1977. The workman joined at Rourkela Branch on 4-7-1977 and reported before the Branch Manager at 9.45 A.M. for allocation of duties. At the time of his joining, it is stated, the post of Cash Peon was vacant and no allocation was made by the Branch authority as Shri Bindhani was relieved on

2-7-1977 which was a Saturday, the subsequent day being the Sunday. Thus there was no scope for the branch management to allocate the work of the Cash Peon. In view of the Bank's procedure and as per the bipartite settlement the workman ought to have been allocated with the job of Cash Peon with special allowance on the basis of his service seniority among the existing sub-staff at that moment. The Agent of the Rourkela Branch, however, allowed the duty of Cash Peon arbitrarily to one Muduli on 4-7-1977 followed by an Office Order dated 5-7-1977. In view of such irregularity and impropriety the Union made a protest and the Bank authorities modified the previous order dated 5-7-1977 on 12-8-77 allowing the workman to work as a Cash Peon with effect from 13-8-1977 to 3-9-1977 on the basis of his service seniority. Some members of staff of the Rourkela Branch objected to it and the matter was referred to R.M.S. Office, Bhubaneswar. The Office of the Regional Manager instructed in their letter No. 12441 dated 19-9-1977 to give special allowance according to seniority. This created a lot of confusion and the matter was again referred to the Head Office for clarification in Rourkela Branch letter No. 12838 dated 20-12-1977. The Head Office remained silent. In reply. In another letter dated 24-8-1978, the Head Office in their letter dated 8-11-1978 advised that at the time of allocating any special nature of job to the sub-employees of the Branch, the seniormost sub-employee shall get the preference. Even then the workman was not granted his legitimate claim.

3. The management's stand, on the other hand, that the sub-staff includes Bill Collector, Cash Peon, Daftry, Zamadar, Nightwatchman, Armed Guard, Liftman, Cyclostyle Machine Operator, etc. The scale of pay of the sub-staff is one and the same, but special allowance at varying rates is attached to each of the above positions commensurate with the duties and responsibilities. The allocation of duties to sub-staff lies within the competence of the Branch Agent or the Branch Manager, as the case may be, and normally assignment is made to a member of the sub-staff on the basis of branch seniority and not on service seniority. A member of the sub-staff is entitled to the special allowance so long as he is in charge of such work. The recipient of the special allowance has the option to give up the work and forego the special allowance.

4. At the relevant period, it is stated, there were nine sub-staff members at the Rourkela Branch, G.C. Bindhani, who was working as the Cash Peon, was in receipt of the special allowance. On his option to go transfer to Kuliana Branch, he was transferred there and was relieved in the afternoon of 2-7-1977 from his duties in the Rourkela Branch. The Branch Agent simultaneously issued verbal orders which was subsequently confirmed in writing to K. Mudi, a member of the sub-staff of the Branch, to perform the duties of the Cash Peon. Muduli though not the seniormost member among the members of the sub-staff of the Rourkela Branch, was the first available seniormost member for being assigned the special duties of a Cash Peon as others senior to him in the Branch had by then been assigned and were doing special nature of duties. The workman has earlier been working as a sub-staff at the Saheednagar Branch of the Bank. On his own request he was transferred to Rourkela Branch on the condition that special allowance, if any, drawn by him would stand ceased on such transfer. The workman joined the Rourkela Branch on 4-7-1977, but as by then there was no scope for special assignment of duties he has no justification to demand special allowance. The Union of the workmen pressurised the local management to yield to their demand for giving cash Peon's job to the workman dislodging Muduli. Under such coercive circumstances the local management allowed the workman to do that job from 13-8-1977. On subsequent clarification the irregularity was removed and from 1-1-1977 the job of Cash Peon was entrusted to R. Iqbal who happened to be the Branch senior sub-staff free and available to take up the special duty post of the Cash Peon of the Branch.

5. It is further stated that the dispute is not an 'industrial dispute' within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The dispute as framed is also not maintainable inasmuch as K. Muduli and R. Iqbal are not made parties to this proceeding.

6. The demand of the workman is that he should be paid Cash Peon's allowance for the period from 4-7-1977 to 4-2-1980 barring the period from 13-8-1977 to 30-9-1977. It appears from Ext. F that this workman has availed of the benefit of special allowance although in different capacities for a period of 250 days in different spells. During the period from 4-7-77 to 4-2-80 therefore, the question that falls for consideration is whether for the remaining days during the period from 4-7-1977 to 4-2-1980 the workman is entitled to cash Peon's allowance. On behalf of the management it is submitted that allocation of duties to the sub-staff lies within the competence of the Branch Agent or the Branch Manager, as the case may be, and normally such assignment of duties to a member of the sub-staff is made on the basis of Branch seniority of the member and not on the service seniority. At the relevant period there were nine sub-staff members at the Rourkela Branch. On the relief of B.C. Bindhani, sub-staff, on his transfer to Kuliana Branch in the afternoon of 2-7-1977 (which was a Saturday), the Rourkela Branch Agent issued verbal orders on that date asking K. Muduli, a member of the sub-staff to perform the Cash Peon's duties. K. Muduli was then the available seniormost sub-staff of the Rourkela Branch. This arrangement, it is stated was made by the Branch Agent as it was not known if U.K. Pandey would join his duties on 4-7-1977. The assignment of Cash Peon's job to K. Muduli was confirmed in writing on 5-7-77. On demand of the trade-union of the workmen of the Bank, the Agent allowed U.K. Pandey to do the cash Peon's job from 13-8-1977, but on subsequent clarification the irregularity was removed and from 1-10-1977 the job of the Cash Peon was entrusted to R. Iqbal who happened to be the seniormost member of the sub-staff of the Rourkela Branch. In this connection it is submitted that the special nature of duties and the special allowance attached thereto are not promotional benefits and no member of the staff can claim such special allowance as a matter of right. It is within the discretion of the management to decide as to which member of the sub-staff should be assigned such post and consequently the special allowance. The contentions of the workman are that on the relief of G. Bindhani in the afternoon of 2-7-1977, there was no urgent necessity to pass any orders for assignment of the Cash Peon's job to K. Muduli. Knowing fully well that U.K. Pandey was expected to join the Rourkela Branch on 4-7-1977, the action of the Branch agent in asking K. Muduli to perform the cash Peon's job on 4-7-1977 was clearly arbitrary and capricious. The management had rightly reviewed its order and allowed U.K. Pandey to do the work of Cash Peon from 13-8-1977 to 3-9-1977. However, on the objections raised by some of the members of staff, the matter was referred to the Regional Manager's Office, Bhubaneswar, and the Regional Manager's Office issued instructions by their letter No. 12441 dated 19-9-1977 to give special allowance according to seniority. The matter was again referred to the Head Office for clarification and the Head office in their letter No. 12050 dated 18-11-1978 advised that at the time of allocation of any special nature of job to any sub-staff of the Branch, the service seniormost sub-staff would get the preference.

7. Two questions therefore arise for consideration—(1) whether in assigning the job carrying special allowance, service seniority or branch seniority should be taken into consideration and (2) whether the action of the Branch Agent in asking K. Muduli to do the Cash Peon's job with effect from 4-7-1977 has been arbitrary and capricious. I have been referred to the General Rules contained in the first bipartite settlement arrived at on the 19th October, 1966. Paragraph 5.8 of the General Rules provides that a workman will be entitled to a special allowance if he is required to perform duty/duties and/or undertake the responsibilities listed against the category, irrespective of his designation/nomenclature or any general authority vested in him. Paragraph 5.9 provides that a workman will be entitled to a special allowance only so long as he is in charge of such work or the performance of such duties which attract such allowance. Whether a workman can be asked to cease to do such work or discharge such duties and consequently cease to draw such allowance, will depend upon the terms of his employment. If, however, a recipient of a special allowance wants to

give up the work or duties which entitle him to the special allowance, he shall if his request is granted, cease to draw the special allowance. Paragraph 5.11 makes it clear that whenever a bank requires a workman to work in a post carrying a special allowance it will normally be done by an order in writing. It would thus appear that the rules do not provide as to whether an employee would be assigned job carrying special allowance on the basis of his service seniority or the branch seniority. It has been urged on behalf of the management that in the absence of any such provision and in view of the prevailing practice the authorities of the management have been assigning such duties carrying special allowance to the employees according to their branch seniority. There is no proof before me that any such practice is in vogue. That apart, it would be fair if assignments of duties carrying special allowance are made on the basis of his service seniority. This view of mine gets support from the provisions contained in paragraph 5.6 of the general rules wherein it is stated that the special allowances prescribed are intended to compensate a workman for performance or discharge of certain additional duties and functions requiring greater skill or responsibility. An employee who is seniormost in the service and not an employee who might happen to be seniormost in the branch is expected to exercise greater skill and responsibility. It can never be the intention of the rules that a junior man, though senior in the branch, shall be entitled to the performance of the job carrying special allowance in preference to senior employees. Ext. 5 is a copy of the letter of the Deputy Chief Officer of the United Bank of India, Personnel Department, Recruitment & Staff Administration, in which it has been clarified that at the time of allocating any special nature of job to the subordinate employees the service seniormost employee shall get the preference. It is further mentioned in this letter that if any service seniormost sub-employee joins the Branch after the allocation of the special job, he will not get the preference. According to the instructions contained in this letter a scope was given to the Branch Agent to assign a job carrying special allowance to an employee of the Branch in the event of the transfer of an employee drawing special allowance. By issue of this clarification, therefore, the question involved was really not solved. An employee by virtue of his service seniority in the absence of anything to the contrary should be assigned a job carrying special allowance. U. K. Pandey being admittedly the seniormost sub-staff would have been entitled to the assignment of job of the Cash Peon carrying special allowance. The Branch Agent, however, with no justifiable reasons allowed K. Muduli to perform the job of the Cash Peon with effect from 4-7-1977. It is stated that he had passed a verbal order on 2-7-1977 after the relief of G.C. Bindhani in the afternoon of that date. As rightly submitted on behalf of the workman there was nothing urgent in passing such a verbal order. Moreover, as provided in paragraph 5.11 of the general rules, if the Branch Agent wanted to assign the job of the Cash Peon to K. Muduli he could have done it in writing. It has not been shown as to what prevented the Branch Agent to pass such an order in writing when the rules require that it should be normally done in writing. The fact that this oral order was subsequently confirmed in writing and that too after the joining of U. K. Pandey would go to show that the action of the Branch Agent was not fair. It was evidently done with a view to deprive the seniormost employee of his right to the special allowance. The order of the Branch Agent, in my opinion, was not justified.

8. In view of the above analysis, the demand of the workman U.K. Pandey for payment of Cash Peon's allowance for the period from 4-7-1977 to 4-2-1980 hearing the period he has drawn the special allowance in different capacities is justified. The management shall allow the Cash Peon's allowance to this workman for the period he was deprived of the same. This shall not, however, affect the privilege of special allowance already availed of by K. Muduli and R. Inbal.

9. The Award is passed accordingly.

30-9-1986

R. N. PANDA, Presiding Officer
(No L-12012/170/83-D.II(A))
N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 28 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. आ. 3806.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकटित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 28th October, 1986

S.O. 3806.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR
Industrial Dispute No. 197 of 1984

Reference No. L-12012/170/83-D.II(A) dt 21-7-84

Shri Man Bahadur Bhandari C/o Shri Tula Ram, R/o Kalabar Giwain Set Tehsil Kotdwara, District Paurigarhwal—Workman.

AND

The Regional Manager State Bank of India, Chief Regional Manager's Office, 52, Rajpur Road, Dehradun.—Management.

STATE :Uttar Pradesh.

APPEARANCES :

Shri V. K. Gupta—representative for the workman.
Shri J. K. Yadav—representative for the Management.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its notification no. L-12012/170/83-D.II(A) dated 21-7-1984, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal :

Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Dehradun in relation to their Kotdwara Branch, Paurigarhwal, in dispensing with the services of Shri Man Bahadur Bhandari, Guard w.e.f. 22-9-76 under the garb of voluntary resignation is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

2. It is common ground that the workman Shri Man Bahadur started working in the management bank at Kotdwara as Badli Guard earlier against relief arrangement and afterwards he was appointed as guard on probation w.e.f. 24th October, 1975, and was confirmed on 24-4-76 after completion of probation of six months. But the workman fell ill in the month of September, 76 and was on leave from 16th to 26th September. He obtained fitness certificate on 23-9-76 but as desired by the Branch Manager Shri R. N. Chopra and two others he extended his leave upto 6-10-76, he however asserts that on 23-9-76 Shri R. N. Chopra branch manager and two others namely Shri A. P. Kala and P. K. Arora obtained his signatures on a paper on the pretext that they would write extension of leave application on that for him. It is further averred that on 5-10-76, the two clerks named above visited his house and told him that leave had been extended till 6-10-76 and they obtained signature of the workman and delivered a letter to him written in English which turned out to be acceptance of his resignation from his services. He was shocked to learn that as he had never submitted his resignation letter and he raised protest on 6-10-76, it appears that his resignation letter was prepared on the paper which was not signed by him on 22-9-76 for extension of his leave. He wanted to

lodge a F.I.R. rather an F.I.R. was lodged against him by the management bank that he had impersonated and submitted a false discharge certificate when as a matter of fact he had never submitted any discharge certificate. On the criminal case started by police he was acquitted vide judgment dt. 11-3-80 and there after the workman was never charge sheeted for having given any discharge certificate of the army for obtaining service in the management that as a matter of fact he never submitted any resignation and had been a victim of the conspiracy. He had consequently prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages.

The management denied other allegations made by the workman in his application averments of any conspiracy or fraud against him rather the management averred that the workman appeared on 22-9-76 before the Branch Manager and submitted his resignation under his signature and that on 5th December, 1976 the memorandum from the branch manager to the effect that his resignation dt. 22-9-76 was accepted w.e.f. the same date was personally received by him. The workman never made any objection before February 77. The management has however, averred that the F.I.R. lodged against the workman on the basis of one anonymous complaint on which the workman was convicted and as the workman submitted his resignation the management did not consider it proper to issue charge sheet to him. Against his conviction the workman preferred an appeal which was allowed on technical grounds but the same has no effect as the resignation of the workman from service was accepted by the management.

4. In support of its contention the management has given three affidavits by way of evidence. First affidavit is of Shri R. N. Chopra who was working as branch manager at the relevant time. He has averred therein that workman was on leave in the month of September, 1976 when a complaint was received and the workman was called in the office. The workman admitted before him that the discharge certificate submitted to the bank belong to some other Man Bahadur. He has further averred that for submission of such a discharge certificate he would not have been appointed in the bank. He has further averred that the workman submitted the resignation dt. 22-9-76 without any coercion, misrepresentation or fraud having been practised on him by any member of the staff. That his resignation was voluntary which was accepted by the management on 5th October, 1976. It may be mentioned here that in the entire affidavit it is nowhere averred that he had submitted any military discharge with the management.

5. In his cross examination branch manager Shri Chopra has admitted that he had called the workman through Shri P. K. Arora and Shri A. P. Kala clerks of the bank. He further admits that the workman did not write any resignation letter before him. He has however, admitted that one Ram Bahadur was head guard when the workman was there in the branch.

6. The other affidavit is of Shri P. K. Arora a clerk of the management branch at the relevant time who has averred that on the basis of the complaint workman Manbahadur was called to the office where he admitted before him that the discharge certificate submitted to the bank belong to some other Manbahadur. He further averred that for submission of such discharge certificate the workman would not have been appointed in the bank. He also averred that the workman submitted the resignation dt. 22-9-76 voluntarily and no misrepresentation or fraud was played against him either by him or by any other member of the staff.

7. In cross examination he admits that he had gone to call the workman from his house alongwith Mr. Kala under the orders of the branch manager. He further states that he took him to the bank alongwith him but he does not know whether the workman came to the bank same day or next day. He also states that the workman did not write any resignation letter before him.

8. The third management witness is Shri A. P. Kala who has averred in his affidavit that the workman was called to the bank and before he admitted that the discharge certificate submitted to the bank belong to some other Man Baha-

dur. He further stated that for submission of such discharge certificate he would not have been appointed in the bank. He also stated that the workman submitted his resignation voluntarily and no fraud was played on him by any member of the staff or by him.

9. He admits that he had visited at the house of the workman to call him under the instruction of the branch manager. He further states that the workman did not give any resignation letter before him.

10. Thus from the evidence of these three management witnesses it emerges that while workman on leave he was called to the bank by the branch manager through the two clerks (witnesses of this case) of the management bank and before them the workman admitted that the discharge certificate submitted to the bank was not that of his. It further emerges that no resignation letter was given before those two witnesses of the management bank. Even the branch manager says that the workman did not write the resignation before him. Thus it is clear that the resignation letter was not signed by the workman before any of the three management witnesses. No evidence has been given by the management that the workman had submitted any discharge certificate of any Man Bahadur son of Shri Tulsi Ram. To a court question the workman deposed in cross examination that he did not give any military discharge certificate in the management bank. In these circumstances he had rightly stated before the branch manager and the two management witnesses who had taken them to the branch when the workman was on medical leave that the discharge certificate on which he was confronted on being shown that the same did not relate to him.

11. The workman in his affidavit had averred that he was appointed by the branch manager Mr. J. K. Ganpati, after perusal of his health and character certificate produced in original in January, 1967 and worked as temporary guard till 5th October, 1976. He has thereafter reiterated the case set out in the claim application that he obtained fitness certificate on 23-9-76 but he was advised by the branch manager Shri Chopra, Shri A. P. Kala and one Shri P. K. Arora to extend leave and they obtained his signature on a paper assuring that they would write leave extension application on that. Subsequently it turned out to be a resignation letter acceptance of which was given to him on his house on 5th October, 1976 by the officials of the management Shri P. K. Arora on the pretext that that was extension of leave and obtained his signature on that typed letter. He learnt about all this fraud and had gone to the bank on 6-10-76 and that when he wanted to lodge a first information report he found that a counter FIR had already been lodged on behalf of the bank against him.

12. In cross examination he deposed that he was illiterate and could sign in Hindi only. He further stated that he had gone to bank on 23-9-76 for duty with medical certificate and fitness certificate where he was told to extend the leave. The workman has also filed that certificate of fitness dated 23-9-76.

14. On 14-4-86 he further stated that the staff wrote his leave extension which he signed and gave it there on 23-9-76. He states that Shri Ram Bahadur head guard was living in his village. He states that Shri Kala and Shri Arora had come to his house on 5-10-76 at 5.30 p.m. when Tula Ram was sitting there. He further states that when he went to join duty on 7-10-76 he was not given duty. When he was not given duty and he was given a typed slip and on getting it read over he came to know that his services have been terminated on that day. He did not signed any paper but had signed it at his house on 5-10-76. He specifically states that he never had a discharge certificate of army. The earliest objection he raised on 9th October, 1976 in writing which was not accepted by the branch manager hence he sent the same to him by post. It may be mentioned here that out of a number postal receipts filed by the workman, the earliest receipt is that of 7-12-76 for a letter to the branch manager State Bank of India, Kotdwara. The workman has filed application dated 6-12-76 addressed to the Regional Manager with a copy to the branch manager Kotdwara probably this is the letter which was sent by the registered post to the branch manager State Bank of India, Kotdwara. The workman has also filed the acknow-

the registered post to the branch manager State Bank of India, Kotdwara. The workman has also filed the acknowledgement of Regional Manager III New Delhi showing that some registered letter was received on 10-12-76 which was sent by the workman and it bears the postal seal of December, 1976. In this application the workman stated all that which is his case in the claim statement. He denied the management's suggestion that he gave any discharge certificate to the bank which do not belong to him for which the management had to lodge FIR against him on which faced criminal prosecution. He also corroborates his case of the claim statement that head guard Shri Ram Bahadur took Rs. 30 per month for favour of getting his employment in his bank. He further denied the management suggestion that he voluntarily resigned on account of fear that he may be involved in a criminal case. He has again reiterated the story that Shri Kala and Shri Arora had come to his house and obtained his signatures on three papers representing that they related to his leave matters. He further states that on the paper they obtained his signature the same were typed in English and on one paper they obtained his two signature, thus in all 6 signatures were obtained by him. He admits his signatures on Ext. M-1 and deposes that the same was given to him on 5-10-76. It may be mentioned here that the same is a typed carbon copy dated 5th October, 1976 and relates that his resignation letter dated 22-9-76 has been accepted w.e.f. that date. He however states that the same was not only half but was a full scape paper and presently only half portion is there and other half is not there and in this way all the papers got signed on the full scape paper. He stated that his father's name is Tula Ram and not Tulsi Ram who was resident of Giwain Kalabar. He further denied that his real name was Pooran Bahadur and previously he was in forest service. He stated in the end that it was on 7-10-76 that paper ext. M.1 was given to him.

15. The workman has also examined two more witnesses in support of his contention except himself. Shri Tula Ram gave his affidavit that in the month of September, 1976 when the workman was ill and when he was sitting with the workman when two bank officials alongwith one more persons came to the workman, handed over two or three papers to him and obtained his signatures on one of them. On enquiry the workman told him that his leave had been sanctioned and the papers relates to that. In cross examination he deposed that it was 5.30 p.m. and had stayed there till the bank officials had left. He has denied the management's suggestion that the workman had gone to the bank alongwith other officials. His affidavit and cross examination relates to the incident when allegedly two officials came to him at his house and on misrepresentation that his leave had been sanctioned obtained his signature on a typed paper which according to the workman representative is the same as Ext. M-1.

16. The affidavit of the other witness Shri Ram Chandra relates to the incident allegedly of 5th October, 1976. when he took Shri Kala and Shri Arora to the house of Man Bahadur and handed over two or three papers to the workman Man Bahadur and obtained workman's signature on one of them. On enquiry that it was told by the workman to him that the same relates to the extension of his leave. In cross examination he testifies that he had taken bank officials to the house of Man Bahadur in the evening at about 5.30. According to him Tula Ram was also there and after staying for about 15 minutes he came alongwith the bank staff and Tula Ram remained sitting with the workman. He also deposes that the bank employees got the typed paper signed by the workman. Possibly he is also relating to ext. M-1 as he too is illiterate.

17. From the evidence narrated above it emerges that some resignation letter dated 22-9-76 duly signed by the workman was there in possession of the branch manager Kotdwara on the basis of which the branch manager wrote letter no. 22/733 dated 22-9-76, paper no. 1 of the documents filed by the management on 12-12-85, copy of which is paper no. 1. A perusal of the letter shows that resignation letter in original was enclosed with the letter. It may be mentioned here that for the reasons best known to the management that resignation letter has not been filed in this court. In this letter management admitted that the workman was appointed as badli guard on 24-1-67 and continued to work as such till 23rd October, 1975 when he

was appointed on probation on 24th October, 1975, and was confirmed. It is further mentioned there in that Shri Ram Bahadur Head guard handed over the anonymous complaint allegedly written by some Man Bahadur, the person who had allegedly written the complaint was summoned to the bank through that head guard Shri Ram Bahadur and the allegations made in the complained were found in consonance with the facts mentioned therein. It was after all this that the workman who was on leave was summoned from his house for interrogation and when Manbahadur confess about impersonation before staff of the bank and requested that his resignation from the bank be accepted. That resignation letter paper bears his signature was enclosed. He further admitted therein the lapses of the branch i.e. verification of distinctive marks was not done, the signatures on the discharge certificate which was in English and the workman's signature were not compared and that the father's name in the certificate is Shri Tulsi Ram where as the fathers name of the applicant given in the application form is Tula Ram. It may be mentioned here that reference of Rambahadur head guard is the same about whom the workman has complained the same from the very beginning that he was instrumental in getting him employed and for that he was charging Rs. 30 per month from him. The management besides original resignation letter has also not filed the application for employment of the workman including army discharge certificate on the basis of which he was allegedly employed. It is not clear whether that discharge certificate was submitted when he was initially appointed as badli guard on 24th July 67 or when he was given probation of six month on 24th October, 1975. It has not been shown that for appointment of badli guard also it is necessary that he should be an ex-serviceman. In the absence of the initial application for employment in the bank it cannot be said that the workman was employed as badli guard on the basis of some army discharge certificate. It may be as deposed by the workman that he was employed as class IV employee in the bank without submitting army discharge certificate.

18. The representative for the workman has also drawn my attention to State Bank of India Recruitment Rules Chapter V, which lays down under rule 38 that the recruitment of guards/watchman would be made from ex-serviceman only. Rule 41 lays down that the age limit would be 18 years minimum and maximum 24 years, regarding relaxation of upper age limit rule 42 lays down that in case of ex-service man relaxation will be to the extent of army service plus three years. A perusal of the Army discharge certificate filed by the management on 12-12-1985 shows that the person Man Bahadur son of Tulsi Ram had served army for one year, 9 months and 19 days. Thus taking maximum age limit 24 years plus three years relaxation for ex army man plus period spent in army, the age at the time of recruitment of this army man should have been 28 years 9 months and 19 days on the date of appointment. The date of birth of the discharge army man is written as 11-8-37 calculating his age on the date of appointment from 11-8-37 on 24th October, 75 the age of the army man as entered would come about 38 years. Even taking his appointment as January, 67, even then his age would come to 29 years 4 months 20 days which was not within the prescribed limit for recruitment as arm guard/watchman in the bank. Thus the employment of the workman on the basis of army discharge certificate could not have been made in the management bank. Further as observed by the branch manager in his letter dated 22nd September, 1976, sent to the Regional Manager, had proper verification and distinctive marks of age, signatures, father's name etc., been done at the initial stage of the appointment, the question of giving appointment as permanent guard and confirming after six months would not have arisen. It appears as suggested by the workman that beyond the entire game of appointment of workman one Ram Bahadur head guard was in picture. Even if they are believed it transpires that the workman visited the bank on 22-9-76, as observed earlier none of the management witnesses admitted that the resignation letter was signed by the workman before them and was the same which was got prepared and signed by the workman. On the other hand the case of the workman is that he had gone to the management bank when an extension of leave was got typed and signed by him with the help of the bank officials. The workman filed 13 documents

on 14-4-86 of which document no. 5 is dated 6-12-76. In this letter the workman under his own signature has written in paragraph 6 that on 22-9-76 when he had gone to the bank and signed the letter of extension of his leave upto 6-12-76 no other letter dated 27-3-77 paper no. 9 was there. He again admitted in para 6 of the same that he had visited the bank on 22-9-76 and had signed an application for extension of his leave after getting the same prepared by the staff. In view of his admission of the fact that the workman had visited the bank on 22-9-76, I am inclined to believe the management witnesses Shri Kala and Shri Arora that they had gone to call the workman from his house at the instance of the branch manager.

19. Now again the question arises whether he voluntarily got a resignation letter prepared and signed or simply extension of leave application and signed it. None of the management witnesses say that the workman voluntarily prepared resignation letter and signed it. If workman had applied for extension of leave on 22-9-76 there was no occasion for him to have obtained fitness certificate from the concerned doctor on 23-9-76. The fitness certificate is dated 23-9-76 on record. The question of obtaining fitness certificate was not there when the workman had voluntarily obtained fitness certificate on 23-9-76. This fitness certificate remained in possession of the workman and was never given in the bank and is coming from the custody of the workman after long hence it can not be said that it was really obtained on 23-9-76 and when the workman visited the bank and which was not accepted. It is argued by the management representative that this certificate was obtained long after for the purpose of the case. If really the workman had signed the resignation letter on 22-9-76, why no independent witness of the bank was examined to show that the same was given voluntarily by the workman. The management has produced and proved Ext. M-1 dated 5-10-76 which is a typed letter of resignation admittedly signed by the workman. Again the question arises whether the signature of Manbahadur workman on it as suggested by him. The management has not lead any evidence on this point as to when and under what circumstances this signature had been obtained on Ext. M-1. In the affidavit of the branch manager Shri Chopra has deposed that acceptance was conveyed to the workman by letter dated such and such. The management should have explained and denied that the two clerks had not visited the workman at his house on 5-10-76, in view of the averments given in para 12 of the claim statement. The workman has lead evidence on that point that two clerks had visited his house on 5-10-76 and intimated that his leave has been sanctioned and obtained his signatures.

20. The management representative has shown that there is contradiction in the affidavit of two workman's witnesses namely Shri Tula Ram and Ram Chandra whereas Tula Ram in his affidavit para 4 stated about sanction of leave on the other hand the other witness Ram Chandra in para 4 of his affidavit speaks that the paper related to extension of leave. I do not see any contradiction in them. A sanction of leave was to be given on application for extension of leave so Ram Chandra had gone with the application for extension of leave, though he did not specifically states that the said application for extension of leave has been sanctioned. In cross examination both Ram Chandra and Tula Ram relate to the same extent. According to Ram Chandra it was the first week of October and according to Tula Ram it was 1st week of September, but corrected the mistake by saying that I was at the house of the workman and he was there near Dewali. Here it may be mentioned that Dewali never falls in the first week of September. No other glaring contradiction have been shown by the management to disbelieve the two workman's witnesses. I consequently believe them. It may be that two witnesses namely Shri A. P. Kala and Shri P. K. Arora visited the workman's house again on 5th October, 76 as deposed by the workman and his two witnesses as there is no denial that they had gone there. I am inclined to believe these two witnesses and it may be that they got signature of the workman on Ext. M-1 representing that his signature was being obtained on the application for sanction of leave.

21. Management representative has drawn my attention to the appointment letter dated 21 October, 75 filed by the workman wherein it is laid down that in the event of any of the declaration/certificate being found false you will

render yourself liable for disciplinary action including removal.

22. A question arose why Shri Ram Bahadur Head guard was taking interest in implicating the workman. It was he who brought the unsigned complaint, then he produced Man Bahadur son of Shri Tulsī Ram to whom the certificate dated 5th June 57 related and on verification and tally of details the branch manager was surprised and coming to the conclusion that it did not relate to workman called him from his house by two of his officials, which fact is admitted to the management witnesses. There is no corroboration of recital in R. N. Chopra letter dated 22-9-76 that the workman made confession of impersonation before members of the staff. The two management witnesses who had gone to call the workman, including the branch manager Shri Chopra himself do not say that the workman confessed having impersonated.

23. On that day the alleged resignation letter dated 22-9-76 being signature of the workman came in possession of the branch manager which he sent to Regional Manager, none of the management witness say workman got it prepared and signed before them. The question arises if the same was obtained fraudulently as deposed by the workman under the pretext of extension of leave or the workman himself fearing prosecution got it prepared and handed over to the branch manager. The branch manager himself has written the lapses by the then branch manager who recruited the workman on the basis of army discharge certificate. In the absence of the workman's application for recruitment as guard, it can not be said if the applicants army discharge certificate was given initially when he sought appointment as bank guard in January 67 or in October, 75. The possibility can not be ruled out that at some time it was head guard Ram Bahadur who got workman employed by submission of stolen discharge certificate with the connivance of its details by the then branch manager and continued to see workman out of service, when workman allegedly stopped his monthly payment. Be it as it may the fact remain that the management has failed to prove that it was workman, who had deliberately given army discharge certificate as his which really did not belong to him.

24. The workman could not have been recruited on its basis had age parentage, tallying of marks village of residence signature given in discharge certificate were made. It is argued that the management just to wash away their latches managed to obtain a resignation letter and in this way wanted to put a screen over their own mistakes. Again when a complaint i.e. the owner of the army discharge certificate was summoned by the head guard Ram Bahadur who two clerks of the branch said to the workman to call him from his house. To call the workman a class IV employee any other class IV or the head guard himself could have been sent. Both the clerks Shri Kala and Shri P. K. Arora admit having gone to the workman to call him to the branch manager on the instruction of the branch manager Shri Chopra.

25. Admittedly the management lodged F.I.R. soon after on 6-10-76 and the workman was criminally prosecuted. He was convicted by the trial Court under section 410 of the IPC on 18-10-79 but was acquitted in appeal on 11-3-80. Much before the conviction from the trial court and almost soon after alleged termination, the workman raised hue and cry and moved application on 7-12-76, to the Regional Manager as well as to the branch manager denying that his signature were obtained on misrepresenting the facts and as a matter of fact he never gave any resignation letter voluntary and consciously.

26. The management should have denied the case set out for 5-10-76 by the workman and lead positive evidence as to how the signature of the workman was obtained on Ext. M-1. The alleged information of acceptance of this resignation letter. On learning about the alleged resignation obtained by fraud he raised objection and requested to withdraw the acceptance. The earliest letter as nearest is of date 6-12-76, which was received in Regional Manager's Office on 7-12-76, vide postal registered receipt filed. The very fact that the workman came out with the case of a obtaining resignation letter by fraud as early as December, 76 i.e. within about two months of the said fraud and long before his conviction in his criminal case shows that the workman had repudiated the alleged resignation.

27. Thus in view of the circumstances discussed above it can not be said that the workman voluntary and consciously resigned his services, rather the same was obtained by fraud just to camouflage the wrong done by the management in the matter of appointment of workman.

28. I, accordingly hold that the action of the State Bank of India, Dehradun in relation to their Kotdwara branch, Paurigarhwal, in dispensing with the services of Shri Man Bahadur Bhandari Guard w.e.f. 2-9-76 is not justified. The result is that the workman is reinstated in service with full back wages.

29. I, therefore, give my award accordingly.

30. Let six copies of this award be sent to the Government for its publication.

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012/170/83-D.II (A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. आ. 3807.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुमरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. की नुदखुरकी कोलियरी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं. 2 चनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 23rd October, 1986

S.O. 3807.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Nudkharkee Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2), AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 33 of 1984

In the matter of Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Nudkharkee Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, R.C.M.S. Union.

On behalf of the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.
STATE : Bihar INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 8th October, 1986

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. I-20012(101)/84-D.III(A), dated the 12th July, 1984.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh that the management of Nudkharkee Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited should pay the same rate of wages and give other benefits to S/Shri Bada Ramchander Beldar, Charitar Beldar, Yoginder Hazari (Chhota), Tapeswar Beldar, Ramdayal Kewat and Shri Iswar Chandra Kumhar, workmen engaged in cover of fire and quench of soft coke in Nudkharkee Colliery, as are being paid

and given to similar workmen of Barora Colliery under the same management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, is justified? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

The case of the workmen is that all the five concerned workmen are permanent employees of Nudkharkee Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. Formerly they were working as wagon loaders but since November, 1976 they were engaged in making soft coke and uniform rate of wages have been prescribed in respect of the entire coal mining industries under the scheme of NCWA-I, II and III. Earlier an industrial dispute was raised by the union of the workmen in respect of some soft coke making workmen of Barora Colliery and the same was adjudicated by the Presiding Officer of Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in Reference No. 28/79 in which an Award dated 28-4-82 was passed. The said award was implemented by the management. The job being performed by the concerned workmen on this reference being the same as that of the workmen of Ref. 28/79, the management ought to have revised the rate of emoluments of the concerned workman in accordance with the revised rate of emoluments as directed in Ref. No. 29/79. But the management did not revise the rate and emoluments. It is submitted on behalf of the workmen that the concerned workmen rely upon the Award passed in Ref. No. 28/79 and claim the same rate of wages and emoluments. It is prayed that an Award be passed in their favour with effect from 22-11-76 since the date when they were put on the job of soft coke makers by the management of the Colliery.

The case of the management is that the Wage structure is governed by the Coal Wage Board Recommendation, NCWA-I, II and III which became effective in the Coal Mining industry. The piece rated workers have been fixed in several groups and the wages for each group have been fixed. In most of the cases work load of the piece rated workers of each group has been fixed. There are certain piece rated workers whose group wages have been fixed but the workload has not been fixed. In such cases the management is required to carry on time study, fix up proper workload and evaluate the rate per tonne of work done or per cubic meters of work completed so that the work of the group get the wages equivalent to their group wages. The said rate varies from colliery to colliery depending upon several mining conditions, situation of the place of work in relation to raw materials, adverse condition of lead and lift for carrying and transporting materials, the regularity of work and amount of work, the bulk of production scheme and outlay etc. As the different factors cannot be equated in all collieries, types of piece rated workers have not been standardised and uniform work rates have not been fixed. NCWA-I, II and III were implemented and certain minimum amount and increase in wages was granted to all categories of workmen. This necessitated review of piece rate for this group of workmen so that the workmen get advantage of the minimum increase contemplated in agreement. In each colliery the piece rate was revised from the then existing rate to ensure minimum increase and accordingly the then existing piece rate the new structures were fixed. If there was difference in such rate, there resulted difference in the revised rate also. The concerned workmen belonged to a group of piece rated workers engaged in firing, blanketing and in quenching the fire in the process of manufacture of soft coke. The group wages of the coke manufacture has been fixed but no uniform work load was fixed. The workload has been differently fixed at different collieries as a result there was variation in the rate per tonne. The JBCCI has not settled the uniform workload in respect of the soft coke manufactures by evaluating various conditions existing at different mines and it is outside the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to make an attempt to fix one rate for all the collieries situated throughout India. There is no scope for comparing the conditions existing in Barora Colliery in area No. I and Nudkharkee Colliery and Block-II which are under two different General Manager. The uniform rate cannot therefore be fixed in respect of the soft coke manufactures of Barora Colliery and Nudkharkee Colliery. The union should have approached the JBCCI in this regard. It was further submitted on behalf of the management that it was not practicable to fix one rate for soft coke manufacturers till uniform conditions of working existed in all the collieries. The concerned workmen are only entitled for protection of their group wages and revision of wages according

to the formula enunciated by NCWA-I, II and III. The rate of workload of the concerned workmen were fixed considering the nature of the jobs performed by them and the rate was revised from time to time according to NCWA. The demand of the workmen is without any basis and is liable to be rejected.

The point for consideration is whether the concerned workmen are entitled to the same rate of wages and other benefits as is being given to the soft coke manufacturers of Barora colliery.

The workmen and the management have examined one witness in support of their respective cases. The workmen have produced documents which are marked Ext. W-1 to W-3. The management's documents are marked Ext. M-1 to M-3.

Some of the facts are admitted. The concerned workmen were permanent wagon loaders of Nudkhurkee Colliery who were required to work as soft coke manufacturers with effect from 29-11-76. Ext. W-1 dated 29-11-76 is the office order to show that these concerned workmen who were previously working as wagon loaders were engaged to work as Soft Coke Manufacturers and were to set fire cover and quench the coal bhatta. It is admitted that the concerned workmen started working as Soft Coke Manufacturers with effect from 29-11-76. It is also admitted that similar nature of job is being performed in Barora colliery where the rate of wages is Rs. 1.75 per day whereas for doing similar job the concerned workmen are getting wages @0.65 per tonne. The main case of the workmen is that as the job being performed by them are same as the job being performed by the Soft Coke Manufacturers of Barora colliery they are entitled to the same wages and emoluments as that of the Soft Coke Manufacturers of Barora colliery from the date they have been engaged as Soft Coke Manufacturers. The workmen have based their case on the Award passed in Ref. 28/79 relating to the Soft Coke Manufacturers of Barora Colliery and the said award dated 28-4-82 is Ext. W-3 in this case. The case of the management on the other hand is that group wages have been fixed in respect of piece rated workers in NCWAs but the work load has not been determined for the piece rated workmen engaged in the manufacture of Soft Coke. It is further stated that the work load is fixed on consideration of various factors relating to the job. The work load of workmen in the manufacture of soft coke has not been fixed and as such it has to be fixed after negotiation. It is on this account that the rate of the workmen in different collieries differ as they are fixed after considering the different condition relating to the purpose of the job. It is true that the group wages of the Soft Coke Manufacturers was fixed by NCWAs but the work load had not been fixed in the different collieries under NCWAs.

It will appear from Ext. W-3 that the demand of the workmen in that case was that they should be given revised wages on the basis of NCWA of 11th December 1974. The management of Barora colliery did not give them the benefit of revised scale according to NCWA-I which came into force on 1-1-75. By an agreement the workmen of Barora colliery engaged in making soft coke were paid @0.62P. per tonne of soft coke manufacture. The only question in that case was whether the soft coke manufacturers should get the benefit of NCWA-I. It was finally decided in that case that in accordance with clause 2.5 of NCWA-I fitment in the revised scale of pay was to be calculated by adding 4.02 to the existing total emoluments of the employees as on 1-1-75 and thus as the existing total emoluments of the concerned workmen of Barora colliery was already fixed by agreement @0.62P. per tonne to which Rs. 4.02 was added in the case of daily rated, the wages of the soft coke manufacturers of Barora colliery was more than the total emoluments of the concerned workmen of the present reference.

Ext. M-1 dated 27-9-76 is a memo which shows that the 6 concerned workmen who were permanent wagon loaders agreed to work in soft coke provided they are not engaged in wagon loading job. Their work load was fixed @ 25 tonne per day on the basis of previous average done by general wagon loaders and they were to be paid Rs. 0.454 per tonne (i.e. Rs. 11.36 for 25 tonnes as basic) in piece rated. This memo appears to be a proposal regarding the

fixation of the rate of the workload of the workmen being engaged in Soft Coke manufacture. It also shows that the said rate and workload was fixed as per discussion in the coordination meeting held on 22-9-76. The said proposal was placed before the General Manager Area No. I for approval. Thereafter Ext. M-2 dated 11/12-11-76 was issued by the Area Manager area No. I. With reference to Ext. M-1 the competent authority approved the proposed workload and payment of Rs. 11.36P. for 25 tonnes as basic in piece rated to the concerned 6 workmen. It appears, therefore, that the rate was fixed at 11.36P. for workload of 25 tonnes as basic in piece rated to the concerned workmen. According to this calculation 0.454 will be the rate per tonne. As the rate of the concerned workmen was fixed @Rs. 0.454 per tonne in 1976 after coming into operation of NCWA-I there was no question of fitment in the revised scale of pay in accordance with para 2.5 of NCWA-I for the purpose of fitment in the revised scale of pay to the existing total emoluments of employees as on 1-1-75 was to be added with the amount of Rs. 4.02 in case of daily rated but as the rate of the concerned workmen were fixed in November, 1976 there was no question of fitment in the revised scale of pay. On the contrary the workmen of Barora Colliery were at their existing rate of wages @0.62 per tonne and those workmen after adding Rs. 4.02 according to para 2.5 of NCWA-I, their fitment in the revised scale of pay was much higher on 1-1-75. The rate of the concerned workmen were fixed at Rs. 0.454 per tonne in November, 1976 and as such there was no addition of Rs. 4.02 in their case, and that led to the difference of the wages between the concerned workmen and the workmen of Barora colliery in accordance with the NCWA-I, II and III.

The rate of the concerned workmen were fixed @0.454 per tonne in accordance with conditions of work load of Nudkhurkee colliery and we have no evidence before us to show that the soft coke manufacturers of Nudkhurkee Colliery and Barora Colliery were working in similar state of conditions and accordingly it is not possible to hold that the concerned workmen and the workmen of Barora colliery entitled to the wages at same rate. I have already explained the reason for the difference of the wages of the Soft Coke Manufacturers of Nudkhurkee colliery and Barora Colliery and there is also no evidence to the effect that the workload of both the collieries is the same and as such I hold that the concerned workmen are not entitled to the same wages as that of the workmen of Barora colliery only because both are engaged in the manufacture of Soft Coke. However, I find that the management have not considered the provision of NCWA-I in fixing the rate of wages of the concerned workmen in November, 1976. It will appear from para 5.1 of NCWA at page 11 that soft coke makers' basic wages was fixed at Rs. 11.59P. and they were placed in Group IV. It will also appear that Rs. 11.36 which was the rate of basic wages fixed to the concerned workmen was the basic wage of Group III. Thus the basic wages of the concerned workmen for working as a Soft Coke maker was not fixed in accordance with the basic wages of Group IV of NCWA-I. Para 2.5 of NCWA-I provides that if the new basic wage is below the minimum of the revised wage scale then the employee shall be given the minimum of the revised scale. The basic wages of the concerned workmen fixed in November, 1976 at Rs. 11.36P. was below the minimum of the revised wage scale of Group IV which was fixed at 11.59 of NCWA-I. The concerned workmen therefore were entitled to the minimum of the revised rate of wages of Rs. 11.59 of Group IV which was the Group in respect of soft coke manufacture. The management therefore has to pay the concerned workmen @ the rate of Rs. 11.59P. since the date they joined as Soft Coke maker and they are entitled to all the difference which may accrue due to the said revised scale of Rs. 11.59P. while fixing their wages in accordance with the NCWA-II and III.

In the result, I hold that the demand of Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh that the management of Nudkhurkee Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.L. should pay the same rate of wages and give other benefits to the concerned workmen engaged in cover of fire and quench of soft coke in Nudkhurkee Colliery as are being paid and given to similar workmen of Barora colliery under the same management of

M/s. B.C.C.L. is not justified. However the concerned workmen are entitled to the difference of wages as indicated in the above paragraph. Award is passed accordingly.

Dated : 8-10-86.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012/101/84-D.III(A)]

का. अ. 3808 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. की पाथेर्डीह कोलियरी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2 धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3808.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Patherdih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 121 of 1986

In the matter of industrial disputes under Section 10(1)(d)
of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Patherdih
Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., and
their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—None.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Ad-
vocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 7th October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012 256/85/D.III(A), dated the 27th February, 1986.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Patherdih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited in dismissing from service their workmen S/Shri Har-khu Rai and Prem Chandra Rajwar, Loaders, was justified? If not, to what relief are these workmen entitled?"

In spite of several adjournment no W.S. was filed on behalf of the union. However, both the parties filed a joint petition stating that as a result of direct negotiation between the management and the sponsoring union, it was agreed to take back the two concerned workmen in the employment as Miner/loader without any liability of the management for back wages. It was also submitted that the two concerned workmen have already joined their duty in accordance with the statement arrived at between them. Both the parties pray that in view of above a 'No dispute' Award may be passed in the present reference. Accordingly a 'No dispute' award is passed.

Dated : 7-10-86.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012/256/85-D.III(A)]
A.V.S SARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 27 अक्टूबर, 1986:

का. अ. 3809 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, टाटा आयरन एंड स्टील लि. की मालकेरा कोलियरी के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध नियोजकों, और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2, धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 27th October, 1986

S.O. 3809.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th October, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri I.N. Sinha, Presiding Officer

Reference No. 51 of 1986

In the matter of an industrial disputes under Section
10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Malkera
Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Limited,
P.O. Jamadoba, District, Dhanbad and their
workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : The concerned workman
himself.

On behalf of the employers Shri P. Akhauri, Asstt.
Chief Personnel Manager.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, 13th October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012 (250)/85-D. III(A), dated the 21st January, 1985.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. P.O. Malkera, District Dhanbad in dismissing from service Shri Titu Chamar, Miner w.e.f. 9-2-1985 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

In this case both the parties filed their respective W.S. etc. Thereafter the case proceeded along with its course. Ultimately on 29-9-86 when the case was fixed for evidence of parties, Shri P. Akhauri, Asstt. Chief Personnel Manager appeared before me on behalf of the employers and filed a memorandum of settlement under signature of both the parties. I have gone through the terms of settlement which appears to be fair and proper. Accordingly I accept the same and pass an award in terms of the memorandum of settlement which forms part of the award as annexure.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012/250/85-D. III(A)]

APPENDIX

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. 2, DHANBAD

Reference No. 51 of 1986

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the Management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd., P.O. Jamadoba, District, Dhanbad.

vs

Their workman (Sri Titu Chamar).

That it is submitted that the Ministry of Labour, Government of India by order No. L-20012(250)/85-D-III(A) dated 21-1-86 referred the following dispute for adjudication by the Honourable Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company, Ltd. P.O. Malkera, District Dhanbad in dismissing from service Sri Titu Chamar, Miner with effect from 9-2-85 is justified? If not, to what relief this workman is entitled?"

The parties above named beg to submit that after detailed discussion the dispute referred to the Honourable Tribunal for adjudication have been settled amicably on the following terms :

- (1) That it has been agreed to employ Sri Titu Chamar on his substantive post of Miner at Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd., subject to his medical fitness.
- (2) That Sri Titu Chamar will not be entitled to receive any back wages or any other monetary benefits during the period he remained dismissed from Steel Company's service i.e. with effect from 9-2-1985 to the date he resumed his duty.
- (3) That he will, however, be granted continuity of service after satisfactory completion of one year of service. The period of absence due to his dismissal shall be treated as "dies-non".
- (4) That above terms of settlement fully resolves the dispute pending before the Honourable Tribunal.
- (5) That the above terms of settlement are fair.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that the terms of settlement be accepted and an award be passed in terms thereof.

(1) Sri Titu Chamar
For workman

For Employer,

M/s Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd.,
Jamadoba,
P.O. Jamadoba, District Dhanbad.

Iron & Steel Company Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th October, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri I. N. Sinha, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 20 of 1986

In the matter of industrial dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd., P.O. Jamadoba, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : The concerned workmen themselves.

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, this 13th October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012(249)/85D. III (A), dated the 6th January, 1986.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd., P.O. Malkera, District Dhanbad in dismissing from service S/Shri Dilip Dusadh and Md. Khalil, Miners w.e.f. 8-4-1985 is justified? If not, to what relief these workmen are entitled?"

Soon after the receipt of the order of reference the same was numbered as Ref. No. 20 of 1986. In this case both the parties filed their respective W.S. etc. Thereafter the case proceeded along with its course. Ultimately, when this case was fixed on 29-9-86 for evidence of parties, Shri B. Joshi, Advocate appeared before me and filed memorandum of settlement under signature of both the parties. I have gone through the terms of settlement carefully. I find the terms of settlement fair and proper and accordingly I accept the same and pass an Award in terms of the memorandum of settlement which form part of the Award as Annexure.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(249)/85-D III(A)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

APPENDIX

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. 2, DHANBAD

Reference No. 20 of 1986

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd.,

P.O. Jamadoba, District, Dhanbad.

vs

Their workmen (S/Shri Dilip Dusadh & Md. Khalil).

That it is submitted that the Ministry of Labour, Government of India by Order No. L-20012(249)/85-D-III(A) dated 6-1-86 referred the following dispute for adjudication by the Honourable Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd.,

का. श्र. 3810.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, टाटा आयरन एंड स्टील लि. की मालकेरा कोलियरी के प्रबंधन से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निरिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2 धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3810.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2 Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Malkera Colliery of M/s. Tata

P.O. Malkera, District Dhanbad in dismissing from service S/Shri Dilip Dusadh and Md. Khalil, Miners with effect from 8-4-1985 is justified? If not, to what relief these workmen are entitled?"

That the parties above named beg to submit that after detailed discussion the dispute referred to the Honourable Tribunal for adjudication have been settled amicably on the following terms :

(1) That it has been agreed to employ S/Sri Dilip Dusadh and Md. Khalil on their substantive post of Miner at Malkera colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Limited subject to their medical fitness.

(2) That S/Shri Dilip Dusadh and Md. Khalil will not be entitled to receive any back wages or any other monetary benefits during the period they remained dismissed from Steel Company's service i.e. with effect from 8-4-1985 to the date they resumed their duty.

(3) That they will however, be granted continuity of service on satisfactory completion of one year of service. The period of absence due to their dismissal shall be treated as "dies-non".

(4) That above terms of settlement fully resolves the dispute pending before the Honourable Tribunal.

5. That the above terms of settlement are fair.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that the term of settlement may be accepted and an award be passed in terms thereof.

For Employer,
M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd.,
Jamadoba,
P.O. Jamadoba,
Dist. Dhanbad.

Dated :
(1) Sri Dilip Dusadh
(2) Md. Khalil

For the workmen.

PRASHANT AKHAURY,

नई दिल्ली, 24 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. आ. 3811 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उत्तर रेलवे प्रशासन बीकानेर डिवीजन के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुसूच में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 24th October, 1986

S.O. 3811.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Northern Railway Administration Bikaner Division, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 35/85

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Netra Pal Singh S/o Shri Phool Singh, r/o Garhi Harsaru through the General Secretary, Railway Casual Labour Union, Near Daga School, Bikaner (Rajasthan).

Versus

1. The General Manager,
Northern Railway,
Baroda House,
New Delhi.

2. Divisional Personnel Officer (Staff)
Northern Railway,
Bikaner (Rajasthan)).
3. Divisional Commissioner Officer,
Northern Railway,
Bikaner.

APPEARANCES :

Shri Bharat Singh for the workman.
Shri J. P. Agnihotri for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-41012(40)/84-D.II(B) dated 25th July, 1985 has referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the Northern Railway, Bikaner Division Bikaner in terminating the services of Shri Netra Pal Singh, Mobile Booking Clerk, Gurgaon with effect from 1-3-82 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled to?"

2. The workman in his statement of claim has stated that he was appointed on the post of Mobile Booking Clerk in the Northern Railway at Gurgaon Station on 24-11-79 and worked upto 28-2-82. He was being paid @Rs. 1.50 per hour. The rate had since been revised to Rs. 2.50 per hour. He became an industrial workman after working more than 240 days continuously in a calendar year. His services were terminated on 1-3-82 by a verbal order which amounted to retrenchment but he was given no notice nor paid any retrenchment compensation and the rule of first come and last go was also violated and he has sought his reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. The Management in its written statement submitted that the claimant had worked for the period from 24-11-79 to 30-6-81 and 8-8-81 to 2-3-82. The workman was appointed for period of six months as a Booking Clerk outside the school hours on payment of Rs. 1.50 per hour for the peak hours in the morning/evening to issue tickets/MSTs to reduce the rush of the passengers with the clear understanding that in case of appointment of regular staff his services would be automatically terminated. As per terms of his engagement his services were not required and as such he was not employed any more. The case of the claimant is not covered by the provisions of section 25-F of the I.D. Act.

4. From the documents on record it transpires that in order to reduce the waiting time of the passengers at the booking counters specially during peak hours or such period, the Railways evolved a scheme of deploying student wards of Railway Employees as Volunteer Mobile Booking Clerk on payment of honorarium. The claimant Netra Pal Singh who was son of a railway employee and a student was employed under that scheme at Gurgaon to perform 5 hours of work daily outside school hours at the rate of Rs. 1.50 per hour. The aforesaid scheme was discontinued vide letter dated 4-12-1981 of the General Manager (Commercial). It is as a result of the discontinuance of the scheme the services of the claimant were terminated w.e.f. 3-3-82. Although the said scheme was discontinued, yet the fact remains as admitted by MW1 Maan Lal Sehgal and also in the written statement, the workman had put in more than 240 days of work in the year preceding to the date of his termination and therefore, the Management ought to have complied with the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act because the termination of service of the workman even though necessitated by the discontinuance of the aforesaid scheme amounted to retrenchment. However, the Management did not serve the requisite one months notice nor payment in lieu of such notice nor did it pay any retrenchment compensation, equivalent to 15 days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months. To this extent the action of the Management cannot be held to be illegal. However, since the very scheme of employment of wards of railway employees as Mobile Booking Clerks has been discontinued, there is no case for rein-

statement of the workman. It may also be noted here that for recruitment to the regular post of booking clerks the candidates have to go through the Railway Service Commission, since the railway employment is a public employment as the 'railways is a State' under Article 12 of the Constitution of India and the Indian Citizens have right to equal chance of employment under Article 16 of the Constitution of India. It is not contended that the post against which the claimant worked in temporary capacity was of a regular nature for which applications were invited from other citizens of India also, giving them equal chance of employment alongwith him. In these circumstances, the workman is entitled to compensation for his retrenchment which in the present case is determined at a lump sum of Rs. 2000. The workman is also entitled to costs which are assessed at Rs. 250. This reference is disposed of accordingly.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this Award may be forwarded to the Central Govt. for necessary action at their end.

September 29, 1986

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-41012/40/84-D.JI(B)]

का. आ. 3812.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार की धारा 33ए के अन्तर्गत श्री बी. डी. तिवारी ने नार्थन रेलवे के प्रबंधक के सम्बन्ध में शिकायत में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 13-10-86 का प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3812.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur in respect of a complaint u/s. 33A of the said Act filed by Sh. B. D. Tewari against the management of Northern Railway, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI R. D. SRIVASTAVA PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 166 of 1983

Shri B. D. Tewari, 96/196, Roshan Bajaj Lane Ganesh Ganj, Lucknow.

AND

Shri Raghoo Ram D.P.O. Northern Railway
Shri N. K. Rastogi Station Superintendent
Union Of India, through The General Manager
Northern Railway Baroda House, New Delhi.

APPEARANCE :

Shri B. D. Tewari—for the workman.
Shri Hamid Qureshi—for the Management.

AWARD u/s. 33-A

1. This is an application under section 33-A of the Industrial Dispute Act, complaining that the service condition of the workman were changed during the proceedings of L.C.A. No. 15/1981 Shri B. D. Tewari Versus Union of India.

2. The case of the applicant is that he was substantively appointed as Head Ticket Collector in the management railway since September, 1967, in grade 425-640 (A.S.). He was posted at Lucknow and acting as Chief Ticket Inspector Station, Lucknow in gr. 550-750 on and before 31-8-81. The applicant had filed an application in this court as LCA No. 15/1981, which was decided exparte in favour of the applicant on 28, December, 1981 in which computation of his money due amounting to Rs. 5017.25 with cost Rs. 100 was made. Railway Administration moved an application for review for which notices were issued to the applicant but after appearing on 18-8-81 could not again appear on medical ground on 30-6 and 16-10. It was during the pendency of this case that the Divisional Personnel Officer, Lucknow in colourable exercise of power vested in him by railway administration changed the service condition of applicant by order on 31-8-81 as follows :

Shri B. D. Tewari HQrs T.C./Lucknow in scale 425/640 (RS) is hereby transferred on his same pay and grade and posted as HQTC/Unnao against the vacancy of Shri Har Charan retired.

3. The applicant preferred an appeal but to no avail and the orders remained as before. Thus the management changed the service condition during the pendency of LCA No. 15 of 1981 without obtaining the permission thereof from the court. The applicant has consequently prayed that the applicant be put back on the post held by him with retrospective effect and punish the guilty officer under section 33(1) of the said Act.

4. Management contested the application on the ground that the application of the applicant is based on false and frivolous grounds, hence is liable to be dismissed. That the workman never worked as Chief Inspector of Ticket at Lucknow station that he was promoted as HTC, Lucknow on 12-4-67 on which post he was never confirmed and retired on the maximum of the grade i.e. Rs. 640. It is however, admitted to the applicant that LCA No. 15/81 filed by the applicant was still pending in which review was pending and on restoration the same is still pending.

5. In the rejoinder the workman asserted that his promotion was made not on officiating capacity but on permanent vacancy and no one else held a lien on the post occupied by him and that from September, 1967 to October, 1982 he worked on the post of HTC in a permanent vacancy.

6. Workman in his affidavit dt. 14-10-85, averred that he was basically HTC in grade 425/640 but was officiating as CIT Head Quarters in place of MP Srivastava who was then utilised as CIT Head Quarters. That the deponent was protected workman being zonal working President of Uttar Railway Karamchhari Union. That during the pendency of 15/1981, the workman was transferred from Lucknow to Unnao on lower grade of Rs. 425/640 and further reduced the pay of the applicant to Rs. 500 per month from Rs. 640 maximum of the grade on which the deponent had reached in the year 1976 this was in addition to be loss of HRA, CCA and other emoluments not payable at Unnao Rly. Station. This transfers was made in disregard of provision of section 33(i) and (3) of the I.D. Act without taking permission of the court where the case was pending.

7. The management examined Shri A. K. Srivastava who stated in examination in chief that the workman was posted as HTC from 12-4-67, but in whose place he was promoted is not mentioned in his service book which was before him. He further admitted that the workman retired as HTC on 31-10-82 and was confirmed TTE on 17-6-68. On the other hand workman gave his affidavit evidence and in cross examination has deposed that he was working as C.I.T. Lucknow, and was reverted as HTC on lower pay and transferred to Unnao, he filed LCA No. 15/81 on 22-1-81 which was decided in favour of the applicant on 24-2-81, but the said order was recalled on 23-5-85 he admitted that he was HTC on shift duty at Lucknow and was working as CIT on the basis of transfer dt. 31-8-81 he handed over at Lucknow on 22-9-81. He further states that being Zonal President of Urku he raised industrial dispute no. 35/83. he further states that he was elected Zonal President in the year 1981 and from 1972 till today he is the Working President.

8. Application under section 33-c-2 registered as 15/81 is pending since January, 1981 and the management change the service condition by transferring him to Unnao was effected in August, 1981. The question to be considered is whether during the pendency of LCA No. 15/81 before the C.G.I.T. cum L. C. New Delhi and subsequently in Kanpur in receipt of an industrial dispute involved therein the management altered to the prejudice of the workman concerned the condition of the service applicable to him immediately before commencement of such proceedings in matter connected with the dispute. In the L. C. A. No. 15/81 the question involved was regarding leave rules as to which set of rules will apply. It is argued that what set of leave rules would apply to the workman as a case was pending before the Central Labour Court where that point was to be determined incidently, the management should not have

transferred him without permission of the court where the case was pending. The workman has filed documents as annexures alongwith the application under section 33-c-2 showing that he made over charge of CIT Station Lucknow to Shri S. C. Giddian. If the workman temporarily asked to look after the work of CIT Lucknow from Shri M. P. Srivastava who was deputed elsewhere that will not make substantive promotion of the applicant and reversion from that post will not amount change in service condition.

9. Regarding transfer of workman from one place to another place without prejudice to his emoluments is within day to day functions of the management and does not amount to a punishment within the meaning of section 33 and permission of the court is not needed for such transfers. The workman had no lien to the post of CIT where he was working and if he was drawing higher pay of that post on reversion he can not lay his claim to that pay as he has no lien to that post rather his substantive post was H.T.C. posted as HTC Unnao against a vacancy there. The order dt. 31-8-81 has been filed by the workman himself. If in view of this transfer order which the management was bound to pass the workman lost CCA and HRA it can not be said that there was loss in emoluments unless it is shown that the order was actuated by unfair labour practice.

10. As observed earlier incidental findings on the point as to what set of rules will apply to the workman amounted to determination on the point of service condition and during pendency of such industrial dispute before labour Court if the workman was transferred it does not mean that his service condition was changed as the management was acting within its right to have done so. In view of the matter transferring the workman from Lucknow to Unnao on his substantive post as HTC on which post he held lien even though he was temporarily officiating as chief ticket inspector at Lucknow will not amount to change in service condition as the management was acting within its right to transfer its employees. The service condition could have been changed in view of pendency of ICA no. 15/81 had the management determined his leave despite pendency of the above case. Transfer from place to other in a substantive post will not amount to change in service condition even of the protected workman.

11. Thus in view of the case discussed above the applicant will not be entitled to be posted back as CIT which post he was holding temporarily in officiating capacity and over which he had no lien.

12. I, therefore, give my award accordingly.

Let six copies of this award be sent to the government for its publication.

Dt : 30-9-86

R B SRIVASTAVA Presiding Officer

[No. L-41025/67/86-D. II(B)]

HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 27 अक्टूबर, 1986

का प्र. 3813—प्रौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, प्रवर प्रौद्योगिक हाकर के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध निवीजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट प्रौद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रौद्योगिक अधिकरण, जयपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 27th October, 1986

S.O. 3813--In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the

industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Superintendent of Post Office and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(90)/1984

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Superintendent of Post Offices, City Division, Nagpur (M.S.) and their workman Shri Prabhakar Mahadeo Mohadikar, Shantinagar, Near Vinayakrao Deshmukh High School, Nagpur (M.S.)

APPEARANCES :

For Workman—Shri V. N. Vagale, Advocate.

For Management—Shri N. V. Natu, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : P&T.

DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.)

AWARD

Dated, September 29, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government vide Notification No. L-40012(31)/83-D.II(B) dated 31st October, 1984, for adjudication of the following industrial dispute :—

"Whether the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices City Division, Nagpur terminating the services of Shri Prabhakar Mahadeo Mohadikar with effect from 10-8-83 without following the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the Shri Prabhakar Mahadeo Mohadikar (hereinafter referred to as the workman) is that he was employed as a casual labour on the post of Postman with effect from 15-4-1981 in the City Post Office, Itwari, Nagpur and he worked there upto 10-8-1983 as is apparent from the certificate given by the Assistant Post Master (Delivery), Nagpur. He discharged his duties in all season with sincerity and honesty during these two years. All of a sudden the department ousted the workman for no reason whatsoever and employed new persons with a view to deprive him of the benefits of regular employment on his completion of further service. This amounts to unfair labour practice and flouting orders of the Central Government. He is a member of backward classes. He rendered service for 273 days in all. The figure of 229 days from July 82 to 30th April, 1983 given by the management is due to intermittent breaks intentionally and fraudulently caused by the department with a view to deprive him of the benefits entitled to get on completion of 240 days. Such artificial breaks in service also amounts to unfair labour practice. He is therefore entitled to be reinstated in service of the department.

3. The case of the management is that Shri P. M. Mohadikar was engaged on daily wages as Postman in leave vacancies and other exigencies of postal requirements. The workman has not completed 240 days service in a year for two years. His days of service with intermittent break are as follows :—

April 1981 to March 1982—273 days.

July 1982 to April 1983—229 days.

He first engaged on 15-4-81 at Nagpur City Post Office and continues to be engaged intermittently afterwards upto April 1983. As per rules the priority has to be given to the approved candidates over the outsiders engaged on daily wages. His services have not been terminated but due to availability of approved candidates he could not be engaged further by the Post Master, Nagpur City, Head Office. The Assistant Post Master (Delivery) Nagpur City Head Office is not empowered to issue such certificate. Rest of the allegations are denied.

4. The management has further raised the legal objections that discontinuance of the workman does not amount to discharge, dismissal or retrenchment hence there is no industrial dispute as defined under Sec. 2(k) of the I.D. Act. Shri Mohadikar is neither a 'workman' nor the management an 'industry' as define under the Act. It is performing the duties of sovereign function hence this reference is not competent.

5. The workman concerned (W.W. 1) has stated on oath that he started working as Postman from 15-4-81 and worked continuously upto 31-7-83. His services were terminated on 31-7-1983 without any notice or compensation. He was given certificates of good service by the Asstt. Post Master under whom he worked. He proved certificates Ex. W/2, Ex. W/3, Ex. W/4 and Ex. W/5. He is Matriculate. Management's witness, Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W. 1) has stated that the workman has worked for the following days :—

1981-82—273 days.

1982-83—229 days.

He has further stated that as per the Departmental Rules, P & T Manual Vol. IV under the heading 'Casual Labour' private candidates are those who are sponsored by the Employment Exchange and passed the test conducted by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices after they have worked each year for 240 days for two years. These workmen were not taken as per above rules since private candidates were available i.e. those were appointed vide Ex. M/2. The number of actual days worked by these workmen has not been challenged before me, I, therefore, take them as correct and proceed on that assumption.

6. The plea of the management is that since this workman in the year 1982-83 (the year of stoppage of work) did not work for 240 days therefore the workman is not entitled to the protection of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act since this section requires continuous service for not less than one year. It has been further contended that as the statement of work done in each year shows that he has in no case "continuous service" therefore he cannot be treated as casual worker on daily wages. I am unable to agree with any of the above contentions of the management in view of the legal position in this regard. For the purpose of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act the legislature has created a legal fiction by way of Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act. Firstly Sub-Section (1) of Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act lays down that the workman shall be deemed to be in continuous service "for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service including or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman". In the instant case, it is crystal clear that cessation of work in every month was not due to any fault on the part of the workman but in fact it appears that the workman was given artificial breaks intentionally or because the work was not available for him, therefore on account of legal fiction he will be deemed to have been in continuous service for that period.

7. Second limb of the management's contention is that in any case in the year 1982-83 he did not work for 240 days. This too is fallacious. In his book 'The Law of Industrial Disputes' Fourth Edition Vol. 2 learned Author, Shri O.P. Malhotra, relying on various authorities at pages 1311-1312 has commented as under:—

"Sub-section (2) provides for a fiction to treat a workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered an uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered service for a period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in Sub-section 2 (a), it is necessary to determine first the relevant date i.e. the date of termination of service which is complained of as 'retrenchment'. After that date is ascertained, move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months the workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favour of the workman, pursuant to the

deeming fiction enacted in sub-section (2), it will have to be assumed that the workman is in "continuous service for a period of one year", and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25 B."

8. Another learned Author, Shri Vithalbhai B. Patel in his book 'Law on Industrial Disputes' 3rd Edn. Vol. 1 has reiterated the above view at page 757 in the following words:—

"Continuity of service does not necessarily mean that a workman must have one completed year of service in every year. It is sufficient that continuity of service exists and arises even if a workman works for the number of days specified in the section during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, because the fiction converts service of specified number of days into continuous service for one complete year."

9. Neither the management has pointed out any reason nor I see so to differ from the views of the learned Authors. In any case the wordings of the Section 25B also go to show that this interpretation is the only plausible interpretation.

10. On behalf of the management reliance is placed on the Recruitment Rules Ex. M/1 Clause 7(c) says that they will be selected and appointed to the number of vacancies in the order of vacancies in order of merit in which they pass the literacy test and had a minimum service of four years and sponsored by the Employment Exchange etc. Clause 9 of these very rules gave preference to ex-departmental casual labourers and part time casual labourers. Therefore burden was on the management to prove and show that they had given an opportunity to this workman that he did fulfil those qualifications. But no such opportunity of even literary test appears to have been given to him. In any way, management's witness Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W.1) has admitted that after Ex. M/1 Departmental instructions dated 21-3-1979 reproduced in the office letter dated 11-11-1983 (Ex. W/7) were issued. Therefore these latest instructions will supersede the earlier instructions. These instructions Ex. W/7 had done away with the requirement of Employment Exchange and the age limit and had given various concession to casual labourers, of course, only for persons engaged upto certain period. Therefore, the principle will apply to the casual employees whose services were dispensed with even later on the principal of natural justice. However, even if I hold that the workman does not qualify for recruitment rules Ex. M/1 and departmental instructions Ex. W/7 even then it does not effect the case of the workman. Once a workman sails the harbour of Section 25F of the I.D. Act his termination for whatsoever reason amounts to retrenchment. In the case of Mohan Lal Vs. Management of M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd. (AIR 1981 SC 1253) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under :—

"Niceties and semantics apart, termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever would constitute retrenchment except in cases in the section itself."

In AIR 1980 SC 1215 it has been even held that the discharge for not passing test for Foreman amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. In the instant case, admittedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. Therefore the retrenchment is void ab initio.

11. The third limb of the management's contention is that his discontinuance of service does not amount to retrenchment etc. Therefore it does not amount to an industrial dispute. I have already held that it amounts to retrenchment. Secondly Section 2A of the I.D. Act clearly says that where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute.

12. Fourth and the last contention of the management is that the management was acting in his sovereign function and the workman is neither a 'workman' nor the management.

on 'industry' such a contention has been repelled in the case of P & T Department Vs. Its Workmen [1984-FLR(49) 57]. Since his discontinuance amount to retrenchment it being void I answer the reference as under :—

That the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, City Division, Nagpur in termination the services of Shri Prabhakar Mahadeo Mohadikar with effect from 10-8-83 without following the provisions of Section 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 is unjustified. As such as a normal rule he is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and all ancillary reliefs. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer
[No. L-40012/31/83-DII(B3)]

का.आ. 3814.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, प्रवर अधीक्षक डाकघर नागपुर शहर विभाग के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3814.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(10)/1985

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur and their workman, Shri S. K. Mute, Postman, Nagpur, R/o Vivekanand Nagar, Plot No. 45, Nagpur-45.

APPEARANCES :

For Workman—Shri V. N. Vagale, Advocate.

For Management—Shri N. V. Nattu, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : P. & T. DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.)

AWARD

Dated : September 25, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government vide Notification No. L-40012(27)/83-D.II(B) dated 11th January, 1985, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Whether the action of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur City Division, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri S. K. Mute, Postman, Nagpur City Post Office with effect from 5-7-1983 is fair just and legal? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. The case of the workman is that he was employed as a casual labour on the post of Postman with effect from 1st May, 1981 in the City Post Office, Itwari, Nagpur. He worked till 5th July, 1983 for about two years as is apparent from the certificate given by the Assistant Post Master. All of a sudden from 6th July, 1983 the management discontinued his employment in order to deprive him of the benefits of regular employment on completion of further service. This amounts to unfair labour practice and flouting orders of the Central Government. He is a member of the backward classes, Non-matric and a son of an Ex-Serviceman retired Postmaster. Shri Krishnarao Govindrao Mute.

3. The case of the management is that he was not employed as a casual labour but only engaged as a daily wages Postman in leave vacancies and other exigencies of postal requirements. Assistant Post Master had no authority to give

him this certificate. In this capacity he worked for the following days :—

1981 — 194 days

1982 — 225 days

1983 — 134 days

Further as soon as the approved candidates becomes available and recruited as per the Indian Postal and Telegraphs (Class IV Posts) Recruitment Rules, 1970 persons engaged on daily wages were discontinued. Rest of the allegations are denied.

4. The management has further raised the legal objections that discontinuance of the workman does not amount to discharge, dismissal or retrenchment hence there is no industrial dispute as defined under Section 2(k) of the I.D. Act. Workman is neither a 'workman' nor the management an 'industry' as defined under the Act. It is performing the duties of sovereign function hence this reference is not competent.

5. Management's witness, Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W. 1) has stated that the workman, Shri S. K. Mute, has worked for the following number of days in each year from 1981 to 1983 :—

1981 — 194 days

1982 — 225 days

1983 — 134 days

He has further stated that as per the departmental rules P&T Manual Vol. IV under the heading 'Casual Labour' private candidates are those who are sponsored by the Employment Exchange and passed the trade test conducted by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices after they have worked for 240 days for two years. These workmen were not taken as per above rules since private candidates were available i.e. those appointed vide Ex. M/2. The number of actual days worked by these workmen has not been challenged before me. I, therefore, take them as correct and proceed on that assumption.

6. The plea of the management is that since these workmen in the year 1981 and 1983 (the year of stoppage of work) did not work for 240 days therefore the workman, Shri S. K. Mute, is not entitled to the protection of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act since this section requires continuous service for not less than one year. It has been further contended that as the statement of work done in each year shows that he has no case of continuous service therefore he cannot be treated as casual worker on daily wages labour. I am unable to agree with any of the above contentions of the management, in view of the legal position in this regard. For the purpose of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act the legislature has created a legal fiction by way of Section 25B of the I.D. Act. Firstly Sub-section (1) of Section 25B of the I.D. Act says that the workman shall be deemed to be in continuous service "for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service including... or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman". In the instant case, it is crystal clear that cessation of work in every month was not due to any fault on the part of the workman but in fact it appears that the workman was given break either intentionally or because the work was not available for him, therefore on account of legal fiction he will be deemed to have been in continuous service for that period.

7. Second limb of the management's contention is that in any case in the year 1981 and 1983 he did not work for 240 days in an year. This too is fallacious. In his book 'The Law of Industrial Disputes' Fourth Edition, Vol. 2 learned Author, Shri O. P. Malhotra, relying on various authorities at pages 1311-1312 has commented that 'Sub-section (2) provides for a fiction to treat a workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered an uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered service for a period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in Sub-section 2(a), it is necessary to determine first the relevant date i.e. the date of termination of service which is complained of as 'retrenchment'. After that date is ascertained, move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the workman has ren-

dered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favour of the workman, pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in sub-section (2), it will have to be assumed that the workman is in "continuous service for a period of one year", and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25F.

8. Now the management has not pointed out any reason nor I see any reason to differ the views of the learned Author. In any case the wordings of Sec. 25B also go to show that this interpretation is the only plausible interpretation.

9. On behalf of the management reliance is placed on the Recruitment Rules Ex. M/1. Clause 7(3) says that they will be selected and appointed to the number of vacancies in the order of vacancies in the order of merit in which they pass the literacy test and had a minimum service of four years and sponsored by the Employment Exchange etc. Clause 9 of these very rules gave preference to ex-departmental casual labourers and part-time casual labourers. Therefore burden was on the management to prove and show that they had given an opportunity to this workman that he fulfils those qualifications but no such opportunity of even literacy test appears to have been given to him. In any way, management's witness Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W. 1) has admitted that after Ex. M/1 Departmental instructions dated 21st March, 1979 reproduced in the office letter dated 11th November, 1983 (Ex. W/3) were issued, Therefore these latest instructions will supersede the earlier instructions. These instructions Ex. W/3 had done away with the requirement of Employment Exchange and the age limit and had given various concession to casual labourers. Of course, only for persons engaged upto certain period. Therefore the principle will apply to the casual employees whose services were dispensed with even later on the principle of natural justice. However, even if I hold that the workman does not qualify for recruitment rules Ex. M/1 and departmental instructions Ex. W/3 even then it does not effect the case of the workman. Once a workman sails into the harbours of Section 25F of the I.D. Act his termination for whatsoever reason amounts to retrenchment. In the case of Mohan Lal Vs. Management of M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd. (AIR 1981 SC 1253) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under :—

"Niceties and semantics apart, termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever would constitute retrenchment except in cases in the section itself."

In AIR 1980 SC 1215 it has been even held that the discharge for not passing test for Foreman amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. In the instant case, admittedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25F of the I.D. Act. Therefore the retrenchment is void ab initio.

10. The third limb of the management's contention is that his discontinuance of service does not amount to retrenchment etc. Therefore it does not amount to an industrial dispute. I have already held that it amounts to retrenchment. Secondly Sec. 2A of the I.D. Act clearly lays down that where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute.

11. Fourth and the last contention of the management is that the management was acting in his sovereign function and the workman is neither a workman nor the management an industry has been repelled in the case of P&T Department Vs. Its workmen [1984 FLR (49) p. 57]. Since his discontinuance amounts to retrenchment it being void I answer the reference as under :—

That the action of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagpur City Division, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri S. K. Mute, Postman, Nagpur City Post Office with effect from 5th July, 1983 is neither fair & just nor legal. As such as a normal rule he is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and all ancillary reliefs. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer
[No. I-40012/27/83-DI(B)]
HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 1986

प्रादेश

का. प्रा. 3815.—केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और उक्त प्रबंधन और यूनियन के औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को माध्यमस्तर के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उप धारा (3) के अधीन उक्त माध्यमस्तर करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ।

अतः, अथ, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यमस्तर करार को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है ।

(करार)

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)
पक्षकारों के नाम :

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

1. श्री एस. रंगनाथन, प्रकाशन
निदेशक, केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण
विभाग, निर्माण भवन, नई दिल्ली ।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :

1. श्री सी. के. प्रसाद, जनरल
सेक्रेटरी, सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी.
मजदूर यूनियन, ई-26, राजा
बाजार, बाबा खड़क सिंह मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली ।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को निम्नलिखित
व्यक्तियों के माध्यमस्तर के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार किया गया ।

1. श्री एम. जी. बनारे, निर्णायक
उप मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय),
श्रम शक्ति भवन, रफी मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली ।
2. श्री जी. के. खेमानी,
मुख्य इंजीनियर,
(टी. धार. जी.),
केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण प्रशिक्षण
संस्थान, ई-विंग, निर्माण भवन,
नई दिल्ली ।
3. श्री एच. एस. बरस, सेक्रेटरी,
सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर
यूनियन, ई-26, राजा बाजार,
बाबा खड़क सिंह मार्ग, नई
दिल्ली ।

(1) विनिर्दिष्ट विवादग्रस्त विषय :

"क्या सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन की अनुसूचित
रोजगारों रूपी (1) सड़कों का निर्माण या अनुसूचित या भवन
संक्रियाएं; और (2) भवनों का अनुसूचित और धावनपथों के निर्माण
और अनुसूचित में नियोजन में दिए गए वर्गीकरण, जैसे कि अनुसूचित
में बताया गया है, के अनुरूप वर्कवाज कर्मचारियों का, और नियमित

वर्गीकरण प्रणाली का 1-1-73 से पुनः प्रवर्गीकरण/पुनः वर्गीकरण के बारे में मांग व्यापकित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं?

- (2) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, 1. मद्रा निवेशक (कार्य) जिनमें अंतर्गत स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है।
2. सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन, ई-26, राणा बाजार, बाबा खड्ग सिंह मार्ग, नई दिल्ली।
- (3) कर्मकार का नाम, यदि वह स्वयं ही विवाद में प्रत्यक्ष हो या यदि कोई संघ प्रत्यक्ष कर्मकार/कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो उसका नाम
- (4) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या लगभग 27,000
- (5) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित सम्भावित प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या लगभग 27,000

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थों का बहुमत वाला विनिश्चय हम पर बाध्य कर होगा और यदि मध्यस्थ एक राय नहीं हो पाते हैं तो निर्णायक का फैसला हम पर बाध्य कर होगा।

मध्यस्थ अपना फैसला समुचित सरकार द्वारा इस करार को सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित करने की तिथि से छह मास की कालावधि या इतने और समय के भीतर, देंगे जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय। यदि पूर्व वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर फैसला नहीं दिया जाता, तो माध्यस्थ्य के लिए निदेश स्वतः रद्द हो जायेगा और हम नए माध्यस्थ्य के लिए बतर्कित करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।

ह./- एन. रंगनाथान, प्रशासन निदेशक, केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग, नई दिल्ली।
ह./- बी. के. प्रसाद, जनरल सेक्रेटरी, सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन, नई दिल्ली।

साक्षी

1. ह./- एम. एल. मेहरा, उप निदेशक (प्रशासन) केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग, नई दिल्ली।
2. ह./- डॉ. पी. श्रीवत्सव, प्रादेशिक श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), नई दिल्ली।
तारीख 1-10-86

अनुबंध

न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम, 1948 की अनुसूची के अनुसार निर्धारित अनुसूची रोजगारों के वर्गीकरण के अनुरूप 1-1-1973 से वर्क चार्ज कर्मचारियों और नियमित दर्जित प्रदियों का पुनः प्रवर्गीकरण/पुनः वर्गीकरण नीचे दिया गया है :-

क्रमिक	पद का प्रवर्ग	वैतनमान	प्रवर्गीकरण/वर्गीकरण
1	2	3	4
1.	वेटर, भिस्ती, वेतमैन, खल सी, माली, फोरिस्ट गार्ड, माइक्रण, सफाई वाला, पानीवाला, चौकीदार, बैरा	196—232 रु.	अनुसूची

उपरोक्त सभी प्रवर्गों में, जहां पदधारियों ने उन पदों पर तीन साल की सेवा पूरी कर ली है, उनका स्वतः ही पद परिवर्तित कर देना चाहिए और 210—290 रु. के वेतन में प्रवर्गीकरण की जानी चाहिए। इस मामले में जो 1-1-73 की सेवा कर रहे थे उन्हें यह समय वैतनमान 1-1-76 से दिया जाना चाहिए।

1	2	3	4
2.	आइ.एस.ए. कनिष्ठ ग्रेडिटर फायर, रेडर, प्रधान माइक्रण, फराश, भिस्ती, लिफ्ट खलसी	240—320 रु.	अनुसूची

तीन साल की सेवा पूरी करने वाले सभी कर्मकारों को पदोन्नति देने के लिए उन्हें 260—350 रु. का वैतनमान दिया जाय।

3. बैलगाड़ी वाला, मेट, सामान पैकर, स्टॉकर, बंधनी धरमो, सविमैन, एयरकंडिशनिंग और रेफ्रिजरेशन, मुख्य माइक्रण, सेनिटरी, जमादार, बिडिंग, जमादार, फायर मैन, रसोइया, फराश-जमादार, प्रयोगशाला-परिचर, रसोइया-बैरा, खलाम गार्ड गेज रीडर, मोटर रीडर, सीवरमैन, स्विचबोर्ड परिचर, लिफ्ट ऑपरेटर (हल्की गति वाली लिफ्टें), ड्रेसर।
- 260—400 रु. अनुसूची

तीन साल की सेवा पूरी करने वाले सभी कर्मकारों को के वैतनमान में न्यूनतम प्रेड देना चाहिए।

1. वरिष्ठ माली, सहायक, प्लम्बिंग-सहायक, प्लम्बर, सहायक धर्मेश्वर, बाइंडर, सहायक लाइनमैन, सहायक मिलन, सहायक वेल्डर, सहायक वायरमैन, सहायक टिनस्मिथ, सहायक टर्नर, सहायक अपहोल्स्टर, सहायक लोहार, सहायक वायलरमैन, सहायक बर्कर, सहायक मेसन, सहायक मैकेनिक, सहायक वेल्डर, सहायक ऑपरेटर (इलेक्ट्रिकल और मैकेनिकल), कैबमैन ऑपरेटर (इलेक्ट्रिकल एंड मैकेनिकल) मैकेनिक (एयर कंडिशनिंग और रेफ्रिजरेशन, चौधरी, धर्मेश्वर, बाइंडर, वायरमैन, लाइनमैन, वेल्डर, टिनस्मिथ, टर्नर, फिटर, वायलरमैन, मेसन, बर्कर, वेल्डर, अपहोल्स्टर, मैकेनिक, केबल जवाइन्टर, प्लम्बर, वर्जी, पत्थर काटने वाला, एम. एल. ड्राइवर, गेड रीलर ड्राइवर, मोल्डर, प्रयोगशाला परिचर, स्टाफ कार ड्राइवर, फायरमैन, जमादार, लिफ्ट ऑपरेटर (हल्की गति वाली लिफ्टें)।
- 330—560 रु. अनुसूची

5. इलेक्ट्रिशियन, वरिष्ठ मैकेनिक (एयर कंडिशनिंग और रेफ्रिजरेशन), वरिष्ठ मैकेनिक, सीनियर ऑपरेटर, पैटर्न मेकर, वायलरमैन, कार्य सहायक, सबक निरीक्षक, प्रधान माली।
- 425—640 रु. अनुसूची

1	2	3	4
6.	फोरमैन, इलेक्ट्रीकल, मैकेनिकल, एयर कंडिशनिंग और रेफ्रिजरेशन, रेडियो मैकेनिकल-एवं आपरेटर, कार्य सहायक, (चयन ग्रेड) सफाई निरीक्षक, सिनेमा, प्रोड्यूसर, परीक्षक, सहायक रेडियो मैकेनिक एवं आपरेटर	425-700 रु.	अतिकुशल ग्रेड-4
7.	तकनीकी आपरेटर, वरिष्ठ मशीन निरीक्षक, इंजीनियर, पर्यवेक्षक और सभी अतिकुशल (परिवर्तित) प्रवर्धारी तीन साल की सेवा के बाद समय-मान में पदोन्नति किए जाए।	455-800 रुपये	अतिकुशल ग्रेड-2
8.	अधीक्षक (इलेक्ट्रिकल एवं मैकेनिकल) और सभी पदधारियों को 3 साल की सेवा के बाद अतिकुशल ग्रेड 2 में परिवर्तन के पश्चात अगले समय-मान में अति कुशल ग्रेड-1 के रूप में पदोन्नत किया जाए।	500-900 रुपये	अतिकुशल ग्रेड-1

टिप्पणी :

- (i) नागरिक/बागवानी के पदोन्नति पदों को अतिकुशल ग्रेड-I, II तथा III में सृजित किया जाए।
- (ii) मांगे गए उक्त अगले वेतनमान उन सभी कर्मचारियों को दिए जाए जो 1-1-1976 अथवा उसके बाद, इनमें जो भी पहले हो, को तीन साल की सेवा पूरी कर चुके हों।
- (iii) उपरलिखित सभी पदों में चयन ग्रेड दिया जाए।

सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन

(पंजीकृत और भारत सरकार से मान्यताप्राप्त)

पंजीकरण संख्या 2562

दूरभाष - 325464

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय :-

ई-26, राजा बाजार,
बाबा खड़ग सिंह मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली।
जनरल सेक्रेटरी,
डी. के. प्रसाद,
सचिव,
एच. एस. वरत

संदर्भ — संख्या सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. एम. डी./ विनांक 8-9-86

श्री. बी. के. प्रसाद,
जनरल सेक्रेटरी,
सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन,
ई-26, राजा बाजार,
डीआई जेड एरिया,
नई दिल्ली।

विषय : सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले माध्यस्थ के लिए सहमति।

महोदय,

कृपया अपने दिनांक 6 नवम्बर, 1986 के पत्र का अवगत कर दें। औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10A के प्रयोजन गेटा बोर्ड के माध्यमों में सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले माध्यस्थ के रूप में एग्रीडारा अपनी सहमति देता हूँ।

भवदीय,

ह०/-

(एच. एस. वरत)

घ. शा. सं. ए-19011/4/86-प्रति. -/8764

भारत सरकार
केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग
प्रतिष्ठान संस्थान
ई.-विंग, निर्माण भवन

जी. के. खेमानी

मुख्य इंजीनियर (प्रशिक्षण)

निदेशक

दूरभाष :- कार्यालय 3018804

नई दिल्ली-110011

घर 670424

दिनांक 10 दिसम्बर, 86

प्रिय श्री रंगनाथन,

कृपया अपने दिनांक 8/9 दिसम्बर, 1986 के घ. शा. पत्र संख्या 8/1/86-ई. सी. एक्ट का अवगत कर दें।

2. मैं, माध्यस्थ बोर्ड में केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग के प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले माध्यस्थ के रूप में नियुक्ति की स्वीकृति भेजता हूँ।

भवदीय,

ह० -

(जी. के. खेमानी)

श्री एस. रंगनाथन,

प्रशासन निदेशक,

सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी.,

निर्माण भवन, नई दिल्ली।

संख्या पी. ए./डा. सी. एन. सी. (डब्ल्यू.)/1/86 दिनांक 18-9-86

टिप्पणी

विषय :- निर्धारित के तामांक 9/9 मुद्रा या एक्ट (केन्द्रीय) को दिनांक 9-9-1986 टिप्पणी सं. 22(6)/86-कोटा-1

सी. पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. मजदूर यूनियन द्वारा प्रस्तुत किए गए 21-सूत्रीय मांग पत्र के बारे में दिनांक 4/5 दिसम्बर, 1986 के सभामोते के संदर्भ में।

मैं, वर्कर्स स्ट्राफ और नियमित वर्गीकृत प्रवर्गों के पुनः प्रवर्गीकरण/वर्गीकरण की मांग का समाधान करने के लिए जिहाज निर्णय माध्यस्थ करूँगे, निर्णायक के रूप में कार्य करने की अपनी सहमति देता हूँ।

ह०/-

(एच. जी. बनारे)

जी. मुख्य श्रमजुन (केन्द्रीय)

[सं. एन-42013/1/86-डी-2(बी)]

हरि सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1986

ORDER

S. O. 3315 :-Whereas an Industrial dispute exists between the management of C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union.

AND WHEREAS, the said management and Union have by a written agreement under Sub-Section (1) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to Arbitration and

have forwarded to the Central Government under (3) of Section 10A of the said Act, a copy of Sub-section the said Arbitration agreement ;

NOW THEREFORE, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 10 A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement;

AGREEMENT

(UNDER SECTION 10-A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of the parties :

Representing employers : Shri S. Ranganathan,
Director of Administration
C.P.W.D. Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.

Representing workmen : Shri B. K. Prasad,
General Secretary,
C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union,
E-26, Raja Bazar,
Baba Kharag Singh Marg,
New Delhi.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of :—

1. Shri M.G. Wanare,
Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), (Umpire)
Shram Shakti Bhavan, Rafi Marg,
New Delhi.
2. Shri G. K. Khemani,
Chief Engineer (TRG),
C.P.W.D. Training Institute,
E-Wing, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.
3. Shri H. S. Vats,
Secretary,
C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union,
E-26, Raja Bazar,
Baba Kharag Singh Marg,
New Delhi.

(i) Specific matters in disputes :

"Whether the demand of the CPWD Mazdoor Union regarding re-categorisation/re-classification of work-charged staff and regular classified categories with effect from 1-1-1973 on the analogy of classification given in the scheduled employment— (i) construction maintenance of roads or in building operations; and (ii) the maintenance of buildings and employment in the construction and maintenance of runways, as listed in the Annexure is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?"

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:

- (a) Director General (Works)
C.P.W.D., Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.
- (b) C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union,
E-26, Raja Bazar,
Baba Kharag Singh Marg,
New Delhi.

(iii) Name of the workman in case he himself is involved in the dispute or the name of the Union, if any, representing the workman or workmen in question :

C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union, representing the workmen.

- (iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.

About 27,000

- (v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to the affected by the dispute.

About 27,000

We further agree that the majority decision of the arbitrators shall be binding on us and in case the arbitrators are equally divided in their opinion, the award of the Umpire shall be binding on us.

The arbitrators shall make their award within a period of six months from the date of publication of this agreement in the official Gazette by the appropriate Government or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

S. RANGANATHAN,
Director of Administration
C.P.W.D. Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi
B. K. PRASAD,
General Secretary
C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union
New Delhi.

Witness

1. Shri S. S. Mehra, Dy. Director (Adm.)
C.P.W.D., New Delhi.
2. Shri D.P. Srivastava,
Regional Labour Commissioner (Central),
New Delhi.

Sd/-

Copy to :—

Sd/-

1. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi.
2. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Kanpur.
3. The Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi.
4. The Secretary to the Government of India,
Ministry of Labour, New Delhi.

ANNEXURE

Re-Categorisation/re-classification of W.C. Staff and regular classified categories w.e.f. 1-1-1973 on the analogy of classification of scheduled employments as per schedule fixed under M.W. Act., 1948, as listed below.

Sl. No.	Category of Post	Pay Scale	Categorisation Classification
1.	Beldar, Bhisties, Chairman Khallasi, Mali, Forest, Guard, Sweeper, Cleaner, Waterman, Chowkidar, Bearer.	Rs. 196-232	Unskilled

All the categories mentioned above, the incumbents of the posts having served for three years shall automatically be converted and paid in the scale of Rs. 210-250 in the present case who were in service on 1-1-1973 be given this time scale w.e.f. 1-1-1976.

2. Sweeper, Jr. Gest. Optrs. Rs. 240-320 Semi-skilled
Head Sweeper, Farash,
Bhisti, Lift Khallasi.

All the workers after putting three years of service by provided pay scale of Rs. 260-350 to provide promotion.

3. Bullockmen, Mate, Syce Rs. 260-400 Skilled
Packer, Stocker, Bandhani
Gharml, Serviceman, Air-
Conditioning and Refri-
geration, Head Sweeper,
Sanitary Jamadar, Build-
ing Jamadar, Fire man,
Cook, Farash Jamadar,
Lab. Attendent, Cook
Bearer, Challan Guard
Gauge Reader, Meter
Reader, Swerman,
Switchboard Attendent,
Lift Operator (Light
speed Lifts), Dresser.

All the workmen after putting three years of service be given selection grade in the pay scale of Rs. 260-430.

4. Sr. Mali, Lineman, Rs. 330-560 Highly Skilled
Plumbing, Asstt. Plumber,
Asstt. Armature Winder,
Asstt. Lineman, Asstt.
Miller, Asstt. Painter,
Asstt. Wireman, Asstt.
Tinsmith, Asstt. Turner,
Asstt. Upholster, Asstt.
Blacksmith, Asstt. Boiler-
man, Asstt. Carpenter,
Asstt. Mason, Asstt.
Mechanic, Asstt.
Welder, Asstt.
Operator, (Electrical &
Mechanical), Caneman,
Operator Electrical &
Mechanical, Mechanic Air-
conditioning and Refri-
geration, Chowdhury,
Armature Winder, Wire-
man, Lineman, Painter,
Tinsmith, Turner, fitter,
Boilerman, Mason, Car-
penter, Welder Upholster,
Mechanic, Cable Jointer,
Plumber, Tailor, Storne
Cutter, M.L. Driver,
Road Roller Driver,
Moulder, Lab.
Asstt., Staff Car Driver,
Fireman, Jamadar,
Lift Operator (High
Speed Lifts).

5. Electrician, Sr. Mechanic Rs. 425-640 Highly Skilled
Air-conditioning &
Refrigeration, Sr. Me-
chanical, Sr. Operator,
Pattern Maker, Boilerman,
Work Asstt., Road
Inspector, Head Gardner.

6. Foreman, Electrical, Me- Rs. 425-700 Highly Skilled
chanical Air Condition-
ing, and Refrigeration,
Radio Mechanical-cum-

operator, Works Asstt.
Selection Grade, Sanitary
Inspector, Cinema Ope-
rator, Surveyor, Asstt.
Radio Mechanic-cum-
Operator.

7. Technical Operator, Sr. Rs. 455-800 Highly Skilled
Sanitary Inspector, Engi- Gr. II
neer, Supervisor, and all
the incumbents of highly
skilled-III (converted)
after putting three years
of service be promoted in
the time scale.
8. Supdg. E&M, & all the Rs. 550-900 Highly Skilled
incumbents after Gr. I
conversion to highly
skilled grade II having
put in 3 years of service
be promoted in the next
time scale as Highly
skilled Gr. I

NOTE :

- (i) Promotion posts for Civil/Horticulture be created in Highly skilled Gr. I, II & III.
- (ii) Next scale demanded above be given to all workers who have completed three years of service as on 1-1-1976 or after whichever is later.
- (iii) Selection Grade be provided in all post mentioned above.

Sd/-

CENTRAL P.W.D. MAZDOOR UNION
(Registered & Recognised by the Govt. of India)
Regd. No. 2562

Ph. : 325464

Central Office :
E-26 Raja Bazar,
Baba Kherag Singh Marg,
New Delhi.

General Secretary : B. K. Prasad
Secretary : H. S. Vats
Ref. No. CPWD M U/

Dated the, 8th Sept., 86.

Shri B. K. Prasad,
General Secretary,
CPWD Mazdoor Union,
E-26, Raja Bazar, DIZ Area,
New Delhi.

Sub: Consent to be arbitrator to represent CPWD Maz-
door Union.

Dear Sir,

Please refer to your letter date 6th Sept. 1986. I hereby give my consent to represent CPWD Mazdoor Union. Is one of the arbitrators in the Board constituted under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-

(H.S. VATS)

D.O. No. A-19011/4/86/-Trg/8764.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
TRAINING INSTITUTE
E-WING
NIRMAN BHAVAN.

G.K. Khemani
Chief of Engineer (Trg.)
Director
Off: 3018804
Tel: Res. 670424

New Delhi, 110011, the 10th Sept' 86

Dear Shri Ranganathan,

Please refer to your D.O. letter No. 8/1/86-EC X dated 8/9th Sept. 1986.

2. I convey my acceptance to the appointment as an Arbitrator of the Board of Arbitrators as the representative of CPWD

Yours Sincerely,
Sd/-

(G.K. KHEMANI)

Shri S. Ranganathan,
Director of Admn.
CPWD, Nirman Bhavan,
New Delhi.

No. PA/DY. CLC(W)/1/86

Dated 18-9-1986.

NOTE

SUBJECT: Note No. 22 (6)/86-CON. I dated 9-9-1986 of CLC(C) nominating Umpire.

Reference Agreement dated 4th/5th September, 1986 of 21-Point Charter of Demands submitted by CPWD Mazdoor Union.

I hereby give my Consent to act as an Umpire to resolve the demands for re-categorisation/classification of work charge and regular classified categories to be decided by arbitrators.

Sd/-

M.G. WANARE

Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner (C).

[No. L. 42013/1/86-D. II (B)]

HARI SINGH, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 24 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. आ. 3816.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, विशाखापट्टनम पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध निष्पक्षता और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण द्वारा दाय के पक्षाद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15 अक्टूबर 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 24th October, 1986

S.O. 3816.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad (AP) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Disputes between the employers in relation to the management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : CENTRAL AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 25 of 1982

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Visakhapatnam
Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

AND

The Management of Visakhapatnam
Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

APPEARANCES

Sri G. Bikshapathi, Advocate for the Workmen. Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy and Kumari G. Sudha, Advocates for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-34012/2/82-D.IV(A) dated 23-6-1982 referred the following dispute under Sections 7A and 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their workman to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust in removing Sri G. Appa Rao, Junior Clerk, from service with effect from 14-9-1979, vide their order dated 14-9-1979 is justified ?

If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 25 of 1982 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the workman mentioned that he was appointed as Junior Clerk and was performing his duties to the entire satisfaction of his superiors in the Secretary Department of the Port Trust. According to him in the Despatch Section which is under the control of Secretary Department separate Clerks are employed for Franking, machine and for despatches by stamps. It is his case that Despatch Section consists of Deputy Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Senior Assistant, Junior Assistant, Clerk and Junior Clerk. Apart from this there is one Supervisory Officer, one Incharge Supervisor and two Supervisors. The Junior Clerk is only to assist the clerk and junior Assistant. It is his case that the primary duty of the supervisor staff to maintain and supervise the work of the despatch section. Instead, the Senior Staff performing their work started leaving with the junior hands without there being any check on their work. According to him though separate Clerks are required to be posted for Franking and despatching. The Petitioner-workman was asked to look after both the works there being any written order to that effect. As per the records the Petitioner is to perform the work of despatch only and is nothing to do with Franking Section.

(a) While so he was issued a charge sheet on 30-7-1977 setting out 14 false and frivolous charge relating to alleged misappropriation as stated therein. The workmen gave a detailed explanation denying the said charges. Though he requested to defend himself by legal practitioner. The Management refused to give such assistance. Though he made a request for supply of specific copies of the documents as mentioned in Annexure III to the charge sheet. The Management simply stated that he could take the copies of the documents from the files. It is pointed out by him that the charge sheeted employee shall be supplied with the copies of the documents mentioned as V.P.T. EMPLOYEES (C.C.A) REGULATIONS. Finally when the enquiry has been insisting that the petitioner should attend the enquiry in spite of repeated requests to furnish him the copies of the documents it was turned down and he was not in a position to defend himself in the enquiry. Therefore he had no opportunity to defend himself and the Petitioner having found that no purpose would be served after cross examination of two witnesses having felt that there was no purpose would serve he was constrained to be away from the proceedings.

(b) There upon it is mentioned by the Petitioner that the Enquiry Board made an enquiry ex parte and gave findings that he was guilty of the charges. So the said enquiry conducted is erroneous and the findings are not done independently and he was served with notice of removal from service for which he submitted an explanation. The disciplinary authority finally passed orders dated 14-9-1979 removing him from service. Thereafter wards he moved the conciliation machinery that resulted in reference to this Tribunal. According to him the impugned order is passed without proper enquiry and the same is unsustainable in law and the action of the Management amounted to victimisation an unfair labour practice and finally it is mentioned that any event the punishment is shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct alleged to have been committed.

3. The management filed a counter stating denying all the allegations. It is admitted that the Petitioner was appointed as Junior Clerk in the Respondent Port Trust Secretary Office with effect from 5-7-1974 but it is done on reversion from the post of Time Keeper in Medical Section as a disciplinary measure, for committing certain irregularities. In order to afford the workmen last and final opportunity to improve himself, the penalty of reduction to the lower post of Junior Clerk was imposed on him. Therefore it is the contention that he had been performing the duties to the entire satisfaction of the superiors is not correct. He was awarded with a punishment of stoppage of increment for three months without commulative effect for negligence in office work. On reversion as Junior Clerk he was posted to work in the Franking Section of the Central Despatch Section of the Secretary's Office, where letters are franked and despatched through post to outside addresses.

(a) All the Departments and Sections of the Port Trust forward letters which are required to be despatched by franking to the franking clerk with a statement showing the postage amounts in duplicate. The Clerk of franking acknowledges the receipt of the letters from the respective departments and sections. One copy is retained in the Central Despatch Section and the acknowledged copy is forwarded to the concerned department/section for record. In case if the Franking machines are sent for servicing/repairs, the Heads of Departments/Sections are informed about it by a letter with a request to send letters etc. by affixing postage stamps. The work of this Clerk is supervised immediately by the Head Assistant. Whenever franking machines are sent for servicing or for repairs, the letters meant for despatch through franking will be sent by affixing postage stamps and the Junior Clerk maintains stamps account for such period, which will be checked by Head Assistant periodically. The statement of the workmen that he was asked to look after both the work is not correct. The nature of work carried out by the Franking Clerk is simply maintenance of Register of Stamps account and Franking of envelopes. The presenting Officer is not a legal practitioner. The Rules of V.P.T. Employees C.C.A. Regulations do not contemplate engaging of legal practitioner to defend the employees. The delinquent in fact inspected documents and took out copies and further stated that he would inspect the remaining documents at later sittings, and subsequently for the reasons best known to him stood ex parte. The enquiry is conducted properly, legally and after giving fair and reasonable opportunity. He did not request for after the receipt of the statement to call for the witnesses for the purpose of his cross examination. He adopted a non-cooperation attitude towards the enquiry board the order of removal dated 14-9-1979 is legal and valid and the same should be confirmed.

4. In this case, on the preliminary issue whether the domestic enquiry was held properly or not after recording the evidence of the Management as MW-1 and verifying the documents from Ex. M-1 to M-25 and also after hearing the counsel for the delinquent workman Sri G. Bikshapathi, this Tribunal had occasion to hold that the domestic enquiry was held properly and all fairness to the delinquent with ample opportunity and that the same is valid and fair. It is passed on 18-3-1986. Thereafterwards both sides did not adduce any further evidence.

5. The question now left out is whether the sentence is properly passed and whether there is any material to show that the sentence is shockingly disproportionate to the punishment of removal. Now the domestic enquiry as per the charge sheet G. Appa Rao, Junior Clerk while he was being placed under suspension as per Ex. M-1 was issued a charge sheet dated 13-7-1977 alleging that G. Appa Rao committed misconduct while functioning as Junior Clerk working in Central Despatch Section of the Administrative Department and misappropriated various amounts drawn by him for purchase of postal stamps by manipulating the entries in the Registers for despatch of letters by franking and by affixing postal stamps and also by falsifying entries in the various records during the year 1976 as shown in the instance 1 to 14 quoted in the charge sheet. Now it is not disputed that G. Appa Rao was functioning as Junior Clerk in the Central Despatch Section of the Administrative Department of V.P.T. and it is also not disputed that the Central Despatch Section is attached to the General Section and all departments and

sections forward all letters required to be despatched by franking by Central Despatch Section. The statement showing the amounts in duplicate, and the clerk incharge of franking acknowledge the receipts of letters from Departments and Sections. One copy is retained in the central despatch section and the acknowledged copy is forwarded to the concerned Departments/Sections for record. If the franking machines are sent for servicing/repairs, the Heads of Departments/Sections are informed about it by a letter and requested to send letters etc., by affixing postal stamps. Normally when a franking machines were in order the letters were not to be despatched by franking except when letters to be despatched urgently after franking time. The postal stamp and the register and the franking account register are being checked by Head Assistant and Assistant Secretary and so forth. The Licence book contains the particulars of the movement of the machines whenever they were sent for servicing/or for repairs. Infact the amount of Rs. 15.90 as shown as expended by franking on 8-10-1976 when franking machines were found actually operated to the extent of Rs. 139.00 on repairs check. Thus there is difference to the extent of Rs. 124.00 by franking was unaccount for in the records. During the period between 5-10-1976 and 8-10-1976 postal stamps to the extent of Rs. 110.15 was shown as expended by the public servant and a sheet containing despatch particulars for 8-10-1976 was found removed from the postal stamp account register. The Sheet was not available for verification, as it would have been destroyed by the public servant. It should have contained entries showing the despatch of letters to the extent of about Rs. 14.00 which if added to Rs. 110.15 would make a total of Rs. 124.00. The fact that an amount of Rs. 124.00 was unaccounted for in the franking despatch register, goes to show that the letters which were shown as having been despatched by affixing postal stamps between 5-10-1976 and 8-10-1976 would have been actually franked after franking machines were received on 7-10-1976 after servicing. All these irregularities involved in misappropriation as mentioned in the charge sheet in Items 1 to 14 were proved by evidence in the enquiry meticulously and the Enquiry Officer as well as Disciplinary authority as per Annexures A, B and C read with Annexure E held that the said Clerk misused the franking machine to the extent of Rs. 245.00 per week or about Rs. 1,000.00 per month on an average during the months of July, August and September, misuse of the franking machine.

6. Now when matters of such grave importance involving financial implications are shown to be misappropriated as clear dato that the registers maintained and when delinquent was not prepared to cross examine the witnesses though he was given fair and reasonable opportunity and when the register established that the delinquent was making entries in the postal stamp account register showing despatch of certain letters with fictitious reference numbers whenever he required some amount for his own purpose. It cannot be said that the public servant is innocent person and that the charges levelled against him were of little consequence as per V.P.T. Employees (C.C.A.) Regulations 1968. It is a fit case where no lenient sentence can be thought of. I do not find after careful consideration of the record in irregularity or any illegal either appreciation of the evidence on the charges or the action taken by the Disciplinary Authority under the V.P.T. Employees (C.C.A.) Regulations 1968. Thus I hold that the removal of Sri G. Appa Rao, Junior Clerk from service with effect from 14-9-1979 vide their Orders of the same date is justified and he is not entitled for any relief.

7. Though the workmen counsel's argument is completed on 2-8-1986, the Management counsel took time for argument to 12-8-1986, and again to 16-8-1986 and even though it is indicated that on that date the Management should finish its arguments on 30-8-1986 and no more adjournments will be given; still the Management counsel reported through one Kumari D. V. Lakshmi Advocate representing the senior counsel that the Management is not ready for arguments. The Counsel for the Workmen opposed stating that sufficient time was granted for arguing the matter and they did not avail the opportunity. On 30-8-1986 this Tribunal had occasion to pass the docket order stating that the request for further adjournments sought for by one Kumari D. V. Lakshmi had no valid grounds and the same was refused and reserved for award and the Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal this the 23rd day of September, 1986.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Industrial Tribunal
Appendix of Evidence

Witnesses Examined
for the Management :
MW-1—Y. Bhadrachalam.
Witnesses Examined
for the Workmen :

NIL

Documents marked for the Management :

- Ex. M-1-By consent—Order of suspension dated 11-10-76 passed by Secretary Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Appointing authority against G. Appa Rao, Jr. Clerk.
- Ex. M-2-By consent—Memorandum of Charges dated 13-7-77 against the employee.
- Ex. M-3-By consent—Employee's reply to the charge sheet dated 23-7-77.
- Ex. M-4-By consent—Order dated 2-8-77 constituting the Board of Enquiry.
- Ex. M-5-By consent—Order dated 2-8-77 appointing a presiding officer.
- Ex. M-6-By consent—Appeal dated 11-8-77 of the Employee to the Chairman, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam requesting to permit him to engage a lawyer to defend his case in the domestic enquiry.
- Ex. M-7-By consent—Letter dated 8-9-77 addressed by the Chairman, Visakhapatnam Port Trust to G. Appa Rao, Jr. Clerk refusing permission to engage a lawyer to defend his case in the domestic enquiry.
- Ex. M-8-By consent—Representation of the employee dated 4-4-78 to Asstt. Personnel Officer and Member of Board of Inquiry Visakhapatnam Port Trust with regard to change the Board of enquiry.
- Ex. M-9-By consent—Letter of the Secretary dated 11-4-78 informing that there is no justification for the charge of Board of enquiry.
- Ex. M-10-By consent—Representation dated 30-1-79 made By G. Appa Rao to the Chairman Visakhapatnam Port Trust, to change the Board of enquiry.
- Ex. M-11-By consent—Chairman's reply dated 14-2-79 to G. Appa Rao, with regard to his representation dated 30-1-79.
- Ex. M-12-By consent—Petition dated 19-2-79 by the employee to the Joint Secretary (Ports) Ministry of Shipping and Transport, Transport Wing, Transport Bhawan, Parliament Street, New Delhi with regard to Disciplinary Proceedings in breach justice.
- Ex. M-13-By consent—Letter dated 8-3-79 of the employee refusing to attend further enquiry proceedings.
- Ex. M-14-By consent—Enquiry report dated 6-7-79 pertaining to G. Appa Rao, Jr. Clerk.
- Ex. M-15-By consent—Show cause notice dated 20-7-79 issued by the Secretary (Disciplinary Authority) proposing the punishment of removal from service.
- Ex. M-16-By consent—Report dated 14-8-79 by the employee to the Show cause notice.
- Ex. M-17-By consent—Proceedings dated 14-9-79 of the Disciplinary Authority imposing the penalty of removal from Service on the employee.
- Ex. M-18-By consent—Appeal dated 23-10-79 by the employee to the Appellate Authority against the punishment.
- Ex. M-19-By consent—Proceedings dated 3-11-79 of the Appellate Authority confirming the punishment imposed upon the employee, by the Disciplinary Authority.
- Ex. M-20-By consent—Daily Order sheet of the Board of enquiry.
- Ex. M-21-By consent—Proceedings of the Board of Enquiry.

Ex. M-22 By consent—Correspondence between the charged employee and the Board of Inquiry.

Ex. M-23—Franking Register from 16-7-76.

Ex. M-24-By consent—Letter dated 9-8-76 from the Chairman, Visakhapatnam Port Trust to K. Umamathy, I.A.S., Director Commerce and Export promotion Department, King Koti Road, Hyderabad with regard to Statistical Bulletin 1974-1975.

Ex. M-25-By consent—Statement showing the postal Dak Medical Section, Secretary's Department Visakhapatnam Port Trust, dated 7-9-76.

Documents marked for the Workmen :

NIL

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Industrial Tribunal
[No. L-34012/2/82-D:IV (A)]

का. जा. 3817—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, विभागाध्यक्ष पत्तन व्यास के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 15 अक्टूबर 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3817.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad (AP) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 10 of 1985

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

AND

The Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

APPEARANCES :

Sri G. Bikshapathi, Advocate—for the Workmen.
Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Kumari G. Sudha, Advocates—for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-34011/13/84-D:IV (A) dated 30th January, 1985 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their Workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication.*

"Whether the action of the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam in not allowing Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao, Fitter Grade I, Electrical Maintenance Section, full pay and allowances for the period of his suspension from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983 is justified? If not, what relief the workmen is entitled to?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 10 of 1985 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the Workers representative of Port and Dock Employees Association, Visakhapatnam it is mentioned that the Petitioner is the Trade Union having registered under the Trade Union Act and it espoused the cause of employee who is the member of the Union in the instance case. According to them the employee is working as Fitter Grade I in the Electrical Maintenance Division of the Ore Handling Complex and he was placed under suspension by the Chief Mechanical Engineer by an order

dated 6-12-1982 under Regulation 7 Z(1) of V.S.T. Employees (C.C.A.) Regulations the suspension of the workman was revoked from 27-1-1983. The Management neither awarded punishment nor any disciplinary case was initiated under the circumstances, the Union mentioned that the Petitioner is entitled to full pay and allowance from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983. The Petitioner as well as the Union has requested the Management for payment of full pay and allowance for that suspension period as there was no response, the matter was referred to the conciliation office and finally to this Tribunal. It is also mentioned that the employee is the Secretary of the Association and the action of suspending him from service and revoking the same amounts to victimisation and unfair labour practice, and that the same would demoralised of the employee for no fault of his. When there is no charge sheet issued to the employee the question of his admission hardly arises. There are number of instances when in similar cases the Management has suspended the employees and subsequently revoked the suspension they were paid full wages with allowances. Therefore in the instance case also Sri A. Sanjeevarao Fitter Grade I is entitled for wages with full allowances for the suspension period from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983.

3. In the counter it is mentioned by the Management that Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao, Fitter, Grade I Electrical Maintenance Section of the Mechanical Department was posted on duty in General Shift on 3-12-1982 and at about 8.30 a.m. the electro hydraulic grab failed functioning during handling coking coal from M. V. "Ratna Vardhana". The Assistant Executive Engineer of the Section, who was supervising the operations at that time, gave orders to Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao, Fitter Grade I to remove the grab's motor which he failed to carry out. He disobeyed the instructions issued to him by his superiors. The Assistant Executive Engineer himself with the assistance of the Foreman on duty had to carry out the job and to commission the grab. This act of Sri A. Sanjeevarao amounted to in subordination and failure to do duties and therefore he was kept under suspension with effect from 6-12-1982 pending institution of disciplinary proceedings against him. The employees in his representation dated 24-1-1983 admitted his mistake which was caused by psychological disturbances and expressed his ignorance towards this mistake committed by him and finally requested for revocation of suspension by pardoning his mistake. Having considered his explanation and taking a lenient view suspension was lifted by the Disciplinary authority and he was taken back to duty with effect from 27-1-1983.

(a) During the period of suspension he was paid subsistence allowance in the office order dated 6-7-1983 it was clearly stated that the period of his suspension from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983 is treated as on duty for all purposes except for the purpose of pay and allowance and that the pay and allowances paid to him during the period of suspension are treated as proportionate pay and allowances. The applicant authority after careful consideration also came to the conclusion there is no reason to modify the order of the disciplinary authority. As, per the rules the employee entitled for full pay and allowance only if in the opinion of the disciplinary authority the suspension is found to be wholly unjustified. In the instant case the employee was founded fault as he himself admitted his fault and pleaded for clemency. The allegation of unfair labour practice is also not correct and it is not correct that he is entitled for full pay and allowance for the period of suspension. As he admitted in his representation dated 24-1-1983 no charge sheet was issued to him as the same was not required. It is true that there were instances where employees were paid full pay and allowance for the period of suspension after revocation as they were found not at fault by the disciplinary authority after due preliminary enquiry. In the instant case A. Sanjeevarao as he admitted his offence in his written representation which affect clearly shows that the suspension was justified. Hence the Tribunal should dismiss his claims holding that there are no merits in this case.

4. The Workmen examined WW-1 A. Rahman as his witness and marked Ex. W-1 to W-4, W-4(a), W-5 and W-6. The Management marked Exs M-1 to M-11 and examined one witnesses MW-1.

5. WW-1 is one A. Rahman who is the General Secretary of the Port and Dock Employees Union which is the registered 1012 GI/86—12

red Trade Union. He mentioned that A. Sanjeevarao, a workman is concerned in this dispute is the Union Secretary working as Fitter Grade I in Electrical Maintenance Section in Visakhapatnam Port Trust. He filed Ex. W-1 as the order of suspension against A. Sanjeeva Rao and the order of revocation is marked as Ex. W-2. The suspension is from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983. According to him as the suspension was lifted without conducting any enquiry the employee is entitled for full wages and allowance for that period and reported that there were number of instances that similarly places persons were paid full wages and mentioned the names of Sri A. Appala Raju, Operator Grade I and Sri Ranganamannaru, Fitter Grade I of Ore Handling Complex. He denied the suggestion that the workers requested the Management to excuse him and therefore the Management did not proceed further and they revoked it. The letter written by him to the Assistant Commissioner of Labour is marked as Ex. W-3 and W-4 as the comments of the Management and Ex. W-5 is the minutes of the conciliation report. Ex. W-6 is the failure report sent to the Government of India. According to him the workman is entitled for wages for the period of suspension. He maintained that their union got more membership than any other union and also mentioned that their Union is participation in several disputes and they are being adjudicated upon and they are pending also before the Tribunal. He denied that he had no personal knowledge about the case of Sanjeeva Rao. According to him as General Secretary he was representing nearly 3,100 employees in different sections and in the department of Port Trust and they have office bearers from all the sections and they will inform him daily and asserted that A. Sanjeeva Rao is Secretary of their union. He also further mentioned that any Electrical Maintenance Section they are representing 80 percent of the workers and the Management procured 20 Grabs for loading purpose in 1980 and they are demanding to create extra cadre post for the Grabs and from December 1982 onwards all the workers revised the work and thus he knew the entire incident. He denied that A. Sanjeeva Rao refused to discharge the duties as per the instructions issued by the Assistant Executive Engineer. He maintained that A. Sanjeevarao is still working in the V.P.T. and he is member of the Union and also Secretary of their union and here is no mention that Ex. W-1 is given for insubordination. According to him the Management failed to frame charges suspension was revoked under Ex. W-2 and it is dated 27-1-1983. According to him he denied that Ex. M-1 letter is given by A. Sanjeeva Rao. According to him there is no such letter given by A. Sanjeeva Rao and signed by him. He mentioned that A. Sanjeeva Rao is available to give evidence in this Tribunal.

6. MW-1 who is the Assistant Personnel Officer incharge of Industrial Relations by name Sri P. S. N. Murthy. He said that he knew the facts of the case of Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao Fitter Grade I was posted in the first Shift duty on 3-12-1982 bluntly refused to carry out the legitimate instructions given by his superiors and thereupon the said work was carried out by the Assistant Engineer and the Supervisor. It is further deposed on account of disobedience of instructions there was delay in Cargo handling operations and the Chief Mechanical Engineer who is the disciplinary authority for necessary disciplinary action basing upon the report marked as Ex. M-2 placed Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao under suspension with effect from 6-12-1982. The suspension order is marked as Ex. M-3. According to him as per Fundamental Rule 53 an employee who is kept under suspension is to be paid subsistence allowance equivalent to 50% of his pay and allowances. Accordingly an order has been passed by the disciplinary authority as per Ex. M-4 and when the disciplinary authority was preparing charge sheet A. Sanjeeva Rao submitted a representation expressing his inability to work on grabs because of psychological disturbances arising out of domestic trouble and sought for mercy and therefore the disciplinary authority revoked the suspension from 27-1-1983. The same is marked as Ex. M-6. The disciplinary authority issued office order treating the period of suspension as duty for all purposes except for the purpose of pay and allowances as per Ex. M-7. He preferred an appeal to the Appellate Authority. The appeal order is marked as Ex. M-9 dated 27-10-1983. He admitted that he is not a technical personnel and he is not a supervisory officer to A. Sanjeeva Rao. He was the witness on 3-12-1982. It is his case that he merely filed records as Industrial Relations Officer of the Management. He also stated that Ex. M-3 did not contain the alleged misconduct. According to him the signatures of A. Sanjeeva Rao was

found on Exs. M-5 and M-8. It is suggested to him that the signature on Ex. M-5 differs from the letter in Ex. M-8. He denied the copy of this marked to the Conciliation Officer is part of the record in Ex. W-4 and it is marked as Ex. W-4A and the date written ink in Ex. W-4A is 3-12-1982 and it admitted that it is typed on 23-12-1982 and corrected as 3-12-1982. It is his case that since there is misconduct by the employee he was paid only 50% of pay and allowances. He conceded that he never gave opinion on these documents and he did not file the said opinion which is verbal. He admitted that he was paid full salary from the date of suspension is revoked i.e. 27-1-1983 and he could not say whether there is anything in record to show that the enquiry is continued after 27-1-1983 and he also conceded that no notice is given or opportunity is given before treating that the payment of 50% pay as sufficient for his alleged misbehaviour. He admitted that stoppage of 50% salary during the period of suspensions amounts to punishment.

7. Afterwards the Management sought for sending the Ex. M-5 as a question document to be examined by an Expert in hand-writing. According to the Management the signature contained in Ex. M-5 is that of A. Sanjeeva Rao who is the workman in this case, while the Workers Counsel denied the same. Hence Ex. M-5 was sent along with the admitted signatures found on Ex. M-8 and subsequently two more documents were sent to the Finger Print Expert as requested. The Hand writing Expert opinion was received in this Tribunal on 28-5-1986 and the report indicated in the opinion of the Handwriting Expert, of the Government of Andhra Pradesh that the person who wrote the read enclosures signature did not write the read enclosure signature marked as 'Q'. In other words Ex. M-8 containing S-1 signature and S-2 said to be a letter written by A. Sanjeeva Rao dated 29-7-1985 and S-3 said to be written by Sanjeeva Rao dated 11-2-1985 and S-4 said to be a letter written by Sanjeeva Rao on 6-7-1985 and S-5 written by A. Sanjeeva Rao dated 4-5-1984 and S-6 signature of A. Sanjeeva Rao found in the representation among others sent by the Tribunal were examined with the disputed signature found on Ex. M-5 and the Expert after careful consideration gave his opinion that disputed the signature which is the basis of requesting, pardon and admitting guilty said to be signed by A. Sanjeeva Rao is not actually signed by A. Sanjeeva Rao. So from the admitted documents which contains the signatures of A. Sanjeeva Rao is marked as S-1 to S-6 when compared with the question document containing the signature of A. Sanjeeva Rao in Ex. M-5. It is found that the said signature did not belong to the person A. Sanjeeva Rao who admittedly signed S-1 to S-6 signatures. In other words the Management relied upon Ex. M-5 which contain so many mistakes and corrections to show as if A. Sanjeeva Rao gave such letter to Chief Mechanical Engineer expressing admission of guilt and requesting him to pardon him. This is denied. If Ex. M-5 goes out of picture there is no document to show that the management had occasion to consider the alleged request to pardon him after the suspension order is issued under Ex. M-3(W-1) or before the revocation under Ex. W-2 (M-6). So the Management failed miserably to show that Ex. M-5 document was signed by A. Sanjeeva Rao with the admitted records supplied by them containing his signatures which was sent to the Handwriting expert of Forensic Science Laboratory, Andhra Pradesh Hyderabad examination of questioned document. The same Expert opinion is marked as Ex. C-1 In fact in the counter in para 9 itself there is admission that there are instances where employees were paid full pay and allowances for the period of suspension after revocation. In the instant case it is not the case of the Management that they contended any preliminary investigation or any charge sheet was issued. They tried to rely upon Ex. M-5 as if it is a document given by A. Sanjeeva Rao pleading guilty and as if he gave a representation on 24-1-1983 requesting to condone and pardon his mistake. The said letter Ex. M-5 is ultimately found when both sides disputed it about its genuineness the Handwriting Expert gave his expert opinion that the same is not written by the person who wrote the standard signature containing S-1 to S-6. So the other cases where similarly persons were given after revocation of suspension etc., are all not necessary to be considered in the instant case. Since the Management admitted that there are certain instances of paying full pay and allowance after revocation of the suspension. In the instant case Ex. M-5 as seen from the evidence of WW-1 would show that the ascertain that A. Sanjeeva Rao gave such a representation under Ex. M-5 to the Disciplinary Authority for revoking suspension seems to be a made

up story and if Ex. M-5 is not there, it is conceded by MW-1 that the workmen is entitled for full pay and allowances for the suspension period as per Rule 53 and Rule 54 of the Standing Orders. Now even according to the Management the said letter Ex. M-5 is given on 24-1-1983 and they passed the order of revocation on 27-1-1983 as could be seen under Exs. W-2 and M-6 and there was no evidence to show that the enquiry was continued after 27-1-1983 with reference to the period of suspension. So when Ex. M-4 goes as a fictitious document and that the signature of A. Sanjeeva Rao on Ex. M-5 was concocted in the Expert opinion and denial of WW-1 and as the Management did not further come forward with any oral evidence contra except filing S-1 to S-6 as admitted documents showing the signatures of A. Sanjeeva Rao. It is manifestly clear that A. Sanjeeva Rao who is the Fitter Grade I, Electrical Maintenance Section never gave such a letter on 24-1-1983 In fact it shows the date "24-3-1983" is corrected as "24-1-1983" and the signature of A. Sanjeeva Rao who is Trade Union activists being the Secretary from the Expert opinion would show that it is not having any similarity either in strokes or in the writing of the similar words or the nature and method of the admitted signatures found on various letters differ from the signature found in questioned document Ex. M-5. So it is manifestly clear that the management of V.P.T. Visakhapatnam took action on Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao who is Trade Union activists being the Secretary with unfair labour practice and kept him under suspension without framing a charge for the alleged incident that he disobeyed to carry out the instructions of his superiors Assistant Engineer on 3-12-1982 and that this is clear case of unfair labour practice and withholding of 50% of pay and allowance by paying subsistence allowance during the period of suspension for no fault of his will not wash the sins of the Management in suspending a Trade Union leader for no fault of his without any charge sheet and also keeping him in suspension against the rules and without even giving notice that he was going to revoke on the basis of his so-called explanation. So all this would show that the Management did this suspension as a sort of victimisation and unfair labour practice. When there is no charge sheet issued to the employee it is hardly imaginable that the employee is prepared to give an explanation after the suspension order, the Management did not issue him any charge sheet, no enquiry was initiated and they pitched upon Ex. M-5 alleged to be signed by him which is there own creation and revoked their own suspension and came forward to say that in view of his explanation admitting guilt that they did not issue the charge sheet. When the alleged incident happened on 3-12-1982 it is surprising that they were keeping quite without issuing a charge sheet till 24-1-1983 when it is alleged that he gave a letter of apology. This seems to be quite unnatural on the admitted facts. Even the said Assistant Inspector, Executive Engineer is not examined in this Tribunal to substantiate the alleged incident said to have happened on 3-12-1982. So it is clear case of victimisation and the worker A. Sanjeeva Rao Fitter, Grade I Electrical Maintenance Section is entitled for full pay and allowances for the period of suspension from 6-2-1982 to 26-1-1983 after deducting the amount paid as subsistence allowance for the period which issued to be paid by the Management, the remaining balance of pay and allowance of his suspension period from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983 must be paid to him forthwith without further delay.

8. It is surprising that the Management comes forward with such concocted documents against Trade Union activist to serve their own undemocratic methods and it is highly objectional and the same is condemned clearly holding it as unfair labour practice.

9. After the expert opinion is received from the Expert, both sides verified the opinion and Workmen Counsel present reported that he had no further arguments in view of the Expert report as could be seen from the docket order dated 2-8-1986. The Management counsel took time from 11-8-1986 and mentioned that the matter is likely to be settled and wanted time and thereafter adjournments were granted from 9-8-1986, 6-9-1986 and 12-9-1986 and as there was no settlement filed, the Management arguments were treated as closed in the given circumstances. Thus Award is passed holding that the action of the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust Visakhapatnam is not justified in not allowing Sri A. Sanjeeva Rao, Fitter, Grade I, Electrical Maintenance Section full pay and allowances for the period of his suspension from 6-12-1982 to 26-1-1983. The work-

man is entitled to his full pay and allowances minus the amount already drawn by him by way of subsistence allowance for that period.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 23rd day of September, 1986.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

Appendix of Evidence

Witnesses Examined

for the Workmen :

WW-1—A. Rahaman.

Witnesses Examined

for the Management :

MW-1—P. S. N. MURTHY.

Documents marked for the Workmen :

Ex. W-1—Suspension Order dated 6-12-82 issued to A. Sanjeeva Rao by the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust.

Ex. W-2—Order of revocation dated 27-1-83 issued to A. Sanjeeva Rao by the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust.

Ex. W-3—Representation dated 7-1-84 made by A. Rahaman, General Secretary, Port and Dock Employees' Association to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C), Government of India, Visakhapatnam with regard to intervention for an amicable settlement.

Ex. W-4—True copy of the detailed comments of the Visakhapatnam Port Trust on the Industrial Dispute between the Management of VPT and their workmen represented by Port and Dock Employees Association over charter of two demands.

Ex. W-4(A)—Copy of the Representation dated 24-1-83 made by A. Sanjeeva Rao to the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

Ex. W-5—Minutes of failure of conciliation proceedings held on 25-2-84 in the dispute between the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their workmen represented by Port and Dock Employees Association over a charter of 2 demands.

Ex. W-6—Failure of Conciliation report dated 5-3-84 between the Management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust and their workmen represented by Port and Dock Employees Association over a charter of 2 demands

Ex. C-1—Finger Print opinion.

Documents marked for the Management :

Ex. M-1—True copy of the Representation dated 24-1-83 made by A. Sanjeeva Rao to the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

Ex. M-2—Report dated 4-12-82 of A.X.F. submitted to Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

Ex. M-3—Suspension Order dated 6-12-82 issued to A. Sanjeeva Rao, Fitter by the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust.

Ex. M-4—Office Order No. CME/E/763, dated 8-12-82 with regard to subsistence allowance to A. Sanjeeva Rao.

Ex. M-5—Explanation dated 24-1-83 submitted by A. Sanjeeva Rao to the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam.

Ex. M-6—Standard form of Order for revocation of Suspension Order dated 27-1-83.

Ex. M-7—Office Order No. CME/E/1387 dated 6-7-83 with regard to suspension and revocation of A. Sanjeeva Rao.

Ex. M-8—Representation dated 4-8-83 made by A. Sanjeeva Rao to the Chairman, Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam with regard to payment of Salary for the suspension period.

Ex. M-9—Proceedings of the Appellate Authority under Regulation 24 of Visakhapatnam Port Employees (Classification Control and Appeal regulations 1968).

Ex. M-10—Bunch of papers relating to Appala Raju's case.

Ex. M-11—Bunch of papers relating to Rangamannaru's case.

Dated : 3-10-1986.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. L-34011/13/84-D.IV (A)]

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 1986

क्र. आ. 3818.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, बैंक आफ मद्रास लि., के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्ध नियोक्ताओं और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचाद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13 अक्टूबर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 30th October, 1986

S.O. 3818.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Bank of Madurai Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th October, 1986.

BEFORE THIRU FYZEE MAHMOOD, B. Sc., B.L.,
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
TAMIL NADU MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Wednesday, the 1st day of October, 1986

Industrial Dispute No. 61 of 1983

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workman and the Management of Bank of Madurai Limited, Madras-2).

BETWEEN

Thiru R. M. Palanippaan,
7/42, Sannathi Street,
II Lane, Vadakkankulam,
Tirunelveli District.

AND

The Chief Officer,
Bank of Madurai Limited,
758, Anna Salai, Madras-2.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-12012/17/83-D. IV(A), dated 27-6-1983 of the Ministry of Labour & Rehabilitation, Department of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Friday, the 5th day of September, 1986 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru N.G.R. Prasad for Thiruvalargal Row and Reddy and R. Rajaram, Advocates appearing for the workman and of Thiru S. Jayaraman, Advocate appearing for the Management and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This dispute between the workman and the Management of Bank of Madurai Limited, Madras-2 arises out of

reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in its Order No. L-12012/17/83-D. IV(A), dated 27-8-1983 for adjudication of the following issue :

Whether the action of the management of Bank of Madurai Limited, Madras in relation to their Vadakkankulam Branch in discharging from service Shri R. M. Palaniappan, Cashier under their Order dated 3-10-81 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. In the claim statement filed, it is stated that the Petitioner Thiru R. M. Palaniappan joined services of the Respondent-Bank on 27-9-1960 as Cashier. He was discharging his work efficiently and to the satisfaction of his superiors. He was transferred to the Vadakkankulam Branch of the Respondent-Bank on 21-2-1975. When he was transferred to that Branch, there was no Branch Manager and he was in-charge of the Branch. On 27-3-1978, one Thiru Irudayam joined as Branch Manager at Vadakkankulam Branch and took charge from the Petitioner. At the relevant period, only three staff were employed in the Vadakkankulam Branch, namely, the Branch Manager, the Petitioner working as Clerk-cum-cashier and one Alagappan working as sub-staff. Same persons were employed as casuals whenever there was any pending work. Whenever the Branch was in need of cash, one had to proceed to Nagercoil to draw the necessary funds. After Thiru Irudayam took charge as Branch Manager, he used to frequently go to Nagercoil to secure funds and did not allow the Petitioner to do this job. In spite of the heavy workload, the Branch Manager directed the Petitioner to attend some special work within a specified time. When the Petitioner expressed his inability to attend to it in addition to his normal work, the Branch Manager insisted on the Petitioner to do the special work. The Petitioner attended to the special work between 14-11-1978 and 25-11-1978 in the available spare time. On 27-11-1978 he went on medical leave because of sickness. The Branch Manager had declined to give the Petitioner overtime to complete the additional work allotted. Whenever the Branch Manager went to Nagercoil he used to take the sub-staff along with him leaving the Petitioner alone in the Bank premises. On 13-2-1979 and 16-2-1979, the Branch Manager went to Nagercoil after locking the Bank premises and taking the key with him. Consequently, the Petitioner had to stay outside the Bank premises till evening until the Branch Manager returned from Nagercoil. By a letter dated 19-2-1979, the Petitioner reported to the Central Office about the Branch Manager proceeding to Nagercoil leaving the Petitioner alone. This letter was sent through the Branch Manager. The Branch Manager sent it to the Central Office with a covering letter dated 20-2-1979 justifying his action. It was alleged that on 13-2-1979 the Bank key was handed over to the Petitioner and he had failed to open the Branch till 5.00 P.M. In furtherance of this, a charge memo was issued to the Petitioner on 30-7-1979, to which, he had given an explanation denying the charges. An enquiry was conducted into the two charges framed against the Petitioner and the Enquiry Officer found him guilty on both the charges. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, the petitioner's services had been terminated. It is contended that the findings of the domestic enquiry officer are perverse and unjustified and not supported by legal evidence. Against the order of discharge he filed an appeal to the Board of Directors which was dismissed by its order dated 29-8-1982. It is stated that the punishment of discharge is grossly disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct alleged. The Petitioner had put in more than 24 years of service and has a large family to support. Hence the Petitioner had raised the present dispute and prayed for setting aside the order of discharge dated 3-10-1981 and for reinstatement in service with back wages and continuity of service.

3. In the counter statement filed on behalf of the Respondent-Bank, the allegations made in the claim statement are denied. The Petitioner joined the services of the Respondent-Bank as Clerk-cum-Cashier and that he was working in the Vadakkankulam Branch from 21-2-1975. In addition to him, there was a Branch Manager and a sub-staff in the particular Branch. On 13-2-1979, when the Branch Manager and sub-staff went to Nagercoil Branch to draw cash, the Branch Manager handed over the keys to the

Petitioner through the sub-staff. However, the Petitioner was not available at the Branch premises between 3.00 P.M. and 5.20 P.M. on that day and it was opened only at 5.20 P.M. The Petitioner had also not attended to the allotted special work. Regarding the preparation of interest application and Central Office Statements, he did not take up the work allotted to him till 25-11-1978. In spite of repeated reminders to complete the work, he proceeded on leave on medical grounds without completing the work allotted to him and thereby he disobeyed the orders of the superiors. The Petitioner was accordingly issued a charge memo dated 30-7-1979 which was based on the complaint given by the Branch Manager dated 30-6-1979. The Petitioner submitted an explanation on 9-11-1979 denying the charges. In enquiry was conducted on the above charges and the Enquiry Officer had held both the charges as proved. A domestic enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and the Petitioner was given full opportunity to put forward his defence. The findings of the Enquiry Officer were fair and based on the evidence on record. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, the Petitioner was discharged from service. The punishment imposed does not warrant any interference. Hence the claim of the Petitioner has to be dismissed.

4. The point for consideration as in the reference is :

Whether the action of the management of Bank of Madurai Limited, Madras in relation to their Vadakkankulam Branch in discharging from service Shri R. M. Palaniappan, Cashier under their Order dated 3-10-81 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

5. The Petitioner Thiru R. M. Palaniappan was examined as W.W.1. No documentary evidence was adduced on his behalf. Exs. M-1 to M-18 were marked by consent and relied upon by the Management. No oral evidence was adduced on behalf of the Management.

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner did not challenge the validity of the domestic enquiry, but made an endorsement confining his arguments to the scope of Section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is now well settled that under Section 11-A, the Tribunal is at liberty to consider not only whether the finding of the misconduct recorded by an employer is correct but also to satisfy itself one way or other regarding misconduct, the punishment and the relief to be granted to the concerned workman on the basis of the materials on record and on reappraisal of the evidence. The main contention raised by the learned counsel for the Petitioner are that the evidence does not substantiate the charge levelled and secondly, even if the misconduct is held to be proved, the punishment awarded is grossly disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed. The Petitioner joined the services of the Respondent Bank on 27-9-1960 as Clerk-cum-Cashier. He was transferred to Vadakkankulam Branch of the Respondent-Bank on 21-2-1975 and was virtually in charge of the Branch. On 27-3-1978, Thiru Irudayam was appointed as Branch Manager at Vadakkankulam Branch. The staff in this Branch consisted of Branch Manager, the Petitioner working Clerk-cum-Cashier and a Sub-staff by name Thiru Alagappan. The Petitioner had sent a representation marked as Ex. D-2 (in the domestic enquiry) dated 19-2-1979 to the Chairman of the Respondent-Bank through his immediate superior, namely, the Branch Manager, Vadakkankulam Branch complaining that the Branch Manager used to frequently go over to Nagercoil situated about 26 kms. from Vadakkankulam along with the only sub-staff for cash drawing leaving the Petitioner alone in the Bank premises from 3.00 P.M. to 6.1 P.M. He had therefore sought suitable protection as the Police Station was situated at Panagudi at a distance of 15 kms. from Vadakkankulam. This was forwarded to the Head Office by the Branch Manager with his covering letter marked as Ex. M-1 (in the domestic enquiry). In this report, the Branch Manager had levelled some allegations of misconduct against the Petitioner which subsequently led to the charge memo dated 30-7-1979 marked as Ex. M-1 in the case being issued to the Petitioner. The two charges framed read as follows :

"Charge No. 1 : On 13-2-1979 at 2.20 P.M. while the Branch Manager and Sub-staff went for cash drawings to Nagercoil Branch, the Branch Manager hand-

ed over the office keys of the Branch to you through sub-staff Shri J. Joseph Kingster. But, you were not available in the Branch premises between 3.00 P.M. to 5.20 P.M. i.e., during working hours of the Branch. Therefore, you have been charged with major misconduct of doing an act prejudicial to the Bank vide clause 19.5(j) of the Bipartite settlement.

Charge No. 2.—Though you were allotted the special work of interest application on Savings Bank Accounts as on 30-11-79 and preparation of Central Office statements vide allotment book on 14-11-78, i.e., well in advance you have not cared to take up the works allotted till 25-11-78 even after repeated reminders to complete and subsequently proceeded on leave on Medical grounds by keeping all works unattended. Due to your disobedience to the orders of your superiors the statements of weekly, fortnightly and monthly were not sent to Central Office in time and the interest application on Savings Banks Account were completed on 4-12-78 by the Branch by engaging some other person.

Therefore, you are charged with wilful insubordination or disobedience of any lawful and reasonable orders of your superior, vide clause 19.5(c) of Bipartite Settlement. Ex. M-3 dated 9-11-1979 was the explanation submitted by the Petitioner and as this was not accepted, a domestic enquiry was conducted on the above two charges. Ex. M-5 were the Enquiry Proceedings and Ex. M-6 the findings of the Enquiry Officer holding both the charges as proved. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer the Petitioner was discharged from service by a letter dated 3-10-1981 marked as Ex. M-7. His appeal to the Board of Directors was also dismissed and paving the way for the present dispute.

7. In respect of 1st charge, in the earlier explanation submitted by him marked as Ex. M-3, the Petitioner had stated that on 13-2-1979, when he returned to the Branch after lunch, he found it was locked and the Branch Manager and Sub-staff (Alagappan) had gone to Nagercoil for cash drawings, following the usual practice adopted. Hence he could not attend to this work in the Bank premises between 3.00 P.M. and 5.20 P.M. and the charge of doing an act prejudicial to the interest of the Bank under clause 19.5(j) of the Bipartite Settlement (a copy of which has been produced before Court) had not been made out. It is conceded by both sides that whenever cash was needed it was the practice of the Branch Manager to go to Nagercoil after 2.00 P.M. and return about 6.00 P.M. Before Sri Irudam, examined as M.W. 1 in the domestic enquiry had taken charge, the delinquent-employee used to do this job. It is also an admitted fact that on 13-2-1979 about 2.00 P.M., the Branch Manager along with his sub-staff Thiru Alagappan left for Nagercoil for cash drawings and no business was transacted in the Bank premises between 3.00 and 5.20 P.M. until the return of the Branch Manager. According to the testimony of Thiru Irudam examined as M.W. 1 (in the domestic enquiry), he had left for Nagercoil along with Thiru Alagappan and made arrangements to hand over office keys of the Branch to the delinquent-employee through sub-staff Thiru Alagappan. When he returned from Nagercoil, he learnt from Thiru Joseph Kingster examined as M.W. 2 (in the domestic enquiry) who was working as a casual employee at the relevant time that the Branch was opened only about 5.20 P.M. by the delinquent-employee. On the other hand, the case of the delinquent employee was to the effect that he had not received the keys from Thiru Alagappan and he had waited outside the Branch till the arrival of the Branch Manager and sub-staff Thiru Alagappan. M.W. 1 (examined in the domestic enquiry) in his deposition before the Enquiry Officer had stated that when he left office at 2.00 P.M. with Thiru Alagappan he was informed by Thiru Alagappan that he had handed over the keys to the delinquent-employee. When he returned about 6.00 P.M. he was informed by Thiru Joseph Kingster (examined as M.W. 2 in the domestic enquiry) that the office was opened only about 5.20 P.M. by the Petitioner. In the earliest report, marked as Ex. M-1 (in the domestic enquiry) submitted by the Branch Manager against the delinquent employee, it was narrated that on 13-2-1979, the keys of the office premises were handed over to the Clerk Thiru R.M. Palaniappan (Petitioner) to

attend the office at 3.00 P. M. but he had not opened the office till 5.20 P.M. No mention was made in the report about the Branch Manager handing over the keys to Thiru Alagappan and directing him to hand over the same to the petitioner nor does it mention about Thiru Joseph Kingster having informed him about the office having been closed between 3.00 P. M. and 5.20 P. M. on the relevant date. Admittedly, M.W. 1 had not seen the handing over of the keys by Thiru Alagappan to Thiru R. M. Palaniappan (Petitioner). Thiru Alagappan for reasons best known to the Management was not examined as a witness in the domestic enquiry. However, a statement marked as Ex. M-7 (in the domestic enquiry) dated 30-6-1979 was produced, wherein Thiru Alagappan has asserted that he had handed over the keys of the Branch to the Petitioner in accordance with the directions of the Branch Manager about 2.20 P. M. on 13-2-1979 before proceeding to Nagercoil. Subsequently, by a communication dated 5-2-1981 marked as Ex. D-4 (in the domestic enquiry) Thiru Alagappan had alleged that he had given the letter Ex. M-7 (marked in the domestic enquiry) only on compulsion by the Management as he was a probationer in the Bank at the relevant time and that he had not handed over the keys to Thiru R. M. Palaniappan (Petitioner) but had himself opened the Branch Office at 6.00 P. M. on 13-2-1979 after returning from Nagercoil. Curiously, the Enquiry Officer had in the absence of examination of Thiru Alagappan given weight to Ex. M-7 (marked in the domestic enquiry) and discarded Ex. D-4 (marked in the domestic enquiry) without assigning any cogent and convincing reasons. In this context, it is pertinent to note that subsequently, a separate enquiry was conducted against Thiru Alagappan and charge memo marked as Ex. M-15 dated 14-2-1981 was issued to him for not having given evidence in the domestic enquiry conducted against the Petitioner. In the reply to this charge memo marked as Ex. M-16, Thiru Alagappan had again reiterated that the letter dated 30-6-1979 marked as Ex. F-7 (in the domestic enquiry against the Petitioner) was not given voluntarily, but only on compulsion by the Management which supports the version as given by him in the statement Ex. D-4 (marked in the domestic enquiry). This casts a good deal of doubt on the testimony of the Branch Manager that he had directed the keys to be handed over to the Petitioner on 13-2-1979 who had not kept the Bank premises open from 3.00 P. M. to 5.20 P. M. as detailed in the charge. On the other hand, it probabilises the version of the Petitioner that he was virtually locked out of the Bank premises from 3.00 P. M. on 13-2-1979 until the premises was opened about 6.00 P. M. after the return of the Branch Manager and sub-staff from Nagercoil. The Enquiry Officer had placed reliance on the testimony of Thiru Joseph Kingster who worked as a casual employee from 5-2-1979 to 17-2-1979. According to the testimony of Thiru Joseph Kingster, on 13-2-1979, he had knowledge that the keys were with the delinquent-employee and therefore had gone to the Branch at 3.00 P. M. and waited till 5.20 P. M. when the Branch was opened by the Petitioner. It is surprising how this witness had acquired such knowledge when there is no evidence on record to establish that the keys were handed over to the Petitioner in his presence or that he was informed of this fact by the Branch Manager or Thiru Alagappan. In this context, it has also to be noted that this witness had even asserted that on 16-2-1979 at 3.00 P. M. he had attended to work in the Bank premises. Even according to the Management on 16-2-1979, the Manager and the sub-staff Thiru Alagappan had left for Nagercoil with the office keys and had returned only at about 5.00 P. M. This is disclosed by the report Ex. M-1 (marked in the domestic enquiry). If this be so, then it is incredible that the witness Thiru Joseph Kingster should testify that even on 16-2-1979, he had worked in the Bank about 3.00 P. M. It only reflects on the credibility of the witness and reveals to what extent he is prepared to perjure evidently to oblige the Branch Manager who had given him casual employment. The Petitioner had also examined one defence witness Thiru Swaminathan in the domestic enquiry for establishing that he was waiting outside the Bank premises on 13-2-1979 till the return of the Branch Manager, who later opened the Branch. He was an independent witness working as Health Inspector in the Primary Health Centre, Vadakkankulam. He had gone over about 5.30 P. M. on 13-2-1979 to the Bank premises to meet the Petitioner in connection with a blood test and found him waiting outside the locked Bank premises

and about 6.00 P. M. the Branch Manager had returned and opened the premises. The deposition of this witness supports the version of the Petitioner and I find no tangible reason as to why his testimony should be discarded when nothing had been elicited in cross-examination to seriously discredit his testimony. The Enquiry Officer had misguided himself into holding the charge as proved and given a perverse finding without a proper assessment of the evidence on record. In my view, the first charge framed against the Petitioner is not established by the evidence on record and the charge of misconduct under clause 10(5)(j) of the Bipartite Settlement is held as not proved.

(8) Regarding the second charge, it is the Management's case that the Petitioner was allotted with some additional work of preparation of interest application on Savings Bank Ledgers and certain other statements for submission to the Central Office which had to be complied with before 30-11-1978. The delinquent-employee admitted that he not complied with the instructions given to him though he had done part of the work and he was on the ground of sickness forced to take leave on medical grounds from 27-11-1978. The fact that the delinquent-employee had taken leave on medical grounds and attended to the part of the additional work entrusted to him is not seriously disputed. The delinquent-employee was working from 1960 onwards in the Bank as a Cashier and had attended to all duties regularly in spite of heavy work. As a matter of fact the evidence discloses that subsequently, an additional staff had been sanctioned to the concerned Branch to cope up with the work. The incident in question relates to 1978, for which, the charge had been issued in July, 1979, after the Petitioner had sent a representation to the Head Office through the Branch Manager which was evidently resented by him. The Enquiry Officer's finding that the delinquent-employee had purposely not carried out the instructions by the Manager and was therefore guilty of wilful in subordination or disobedience of the order of a superior as contemplated by Section 19.5(e) of the Bipartite Settlement is without any basis and cannot be sustained. As adverted to earlier, the petitioner had done part of the additional work allotted to him which he was directed to complete before November, 1978 and he was forced to go on medical leave from 27-11-1978. In the circumstances, it cannot be held that there was any wilful insubordination and disobedience to any order by a superior to hold the charge framed as proved. In my view, the evidence on record does not substantiate the charge levelled. The finding rendered by the Enquiry Officer is perverse and not supported by the evidence on record. As both the charges have been held as not proved and the order of discharge proceeded on the findings of the Enquiry Officer, it has to be necessarily set aside.

(9) Accordingly, the order of termination marked as Ex. M-7 dated 3-10-1981 is set aside and the Petitioner is directed to be reinstated in service with full back wages, continuity of service and other attendant benefits. An award is passed accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

Dated, this 1st day of October, 1986.

(Sd.)

FYZEE MAHMOOD, Industrial Tribunal
WITNESSES EXAMINED

For workman :

W.W. 1—Thiru R. M. Palaniappan.

For Management : None.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For workman : Nil.

For Management :

Ex. M-1/30-7-79—Charge sheet issued to W.W. 1.

Ex. M-2/8-8-79—Letter from the Bank to W.W. 1 amending the name.

Ex. M-3/9-11-79—Reply of W.W. 1 to the charge sheet.

Ex. M-4/28-11-79—Management's letter ordering to hold enquiry into the charge.

Ex. M-5—Enquiry Proceedings.

Ex. M-6/23-4-81—Findings of the Enquiry Officer.

Ex. M-7/3-10-81—Order of discharge issued to W.W. 1.

Ex. M-8/19-11-81—Appeal petition of W.W. 1.

Ex. M-9/23-1-82—Circular to the Bank Branches intimating the discharge of W.W. 1.

Ex. M-10—Resolution of the Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Bank held on 19-1-1982.

Ex. M-11/21-1-82—Order of the Board of Directors confirming the discharge order.

Ex. M-12/7-1-73—Reply of the Management to statement of W.W. 1 sent to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Trivandrum.

Ex. M-13/19-3-83—Letter from W.W. 1 to the Chairman of the Bank for reinstatement.

Ex. M-14/23-3-83—Letter from W.W. 1 to the Chairman of the Bank stating that he will not claim back wages, if he is reinstated in service.

Ex. M-15/14-2-81—Charge sheet issued to Thiru K. Alagappan.

Ex. M-16/29-4-81—Reply of Thiru K. Alagappan to Ex M-15.

Ex. M-17/10-11-81—Findings of the Enquiry Officer.

Ex. M-18/10-2-82—Chairman's order confirming the proposed punishment of stoppage of one increment.

(Sd.) FYZEE MAHMOOD.

Industrial Tribunal

[No. L-12012/17/83-D.IV(A)]

क्र. आ. 3819.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूच में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पंजाब नेशनल बैंक, लखनऊ के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध निवृत्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9 अक्टूबर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3819.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Disputes between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank, Lucknow and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANPUR.

Reference No. L-12012/21/85-D.IV-A Dt. 6-2-1986.

Industrial Dispute No. 34 of 1986.

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Dil Bahadur C/o The State Vice President, UPBEC
295/387 Din Dayal Road, Lucknow.

AND

The Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, Ashok Marg, Lucknow.

APPEARANCE :

Shri O. P. Nigam—representative for the workman.

Shri Pradeem Kumar—representative for the Manager

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its notification No. L-12012/21/85-B-IV(A) dt. 6-2-1986, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in retiring Shri Dil Bahadur Guard,

Sadar Bazar Branch, Lucknow w.e.f. 16-5-84 (16th May, 1984), is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

2. It is common ground that the workman Shri Dil Bahadur joined the service of the management bank w.e.f. 1-7-48 as armed guard at branch office Sadar Bazar Lucknow. It is further admitted that he was retired from the management bank on 30-4-84/16-5-84 after permission from the ALC Central Kanpur where the workman after receiving notice of retirement had raised industrial dispute. According to the workman no form was got filled from him giving his date of birth etc; that this matter of entering date of birth in service record arose in the year 1981. The workman could not study in any school. The branch manager thereafter required the workman to obtain the certificate of age from the medical officer and gave him a letter dt. 21-9-81 to that effect for the civil surgeon Lucknow, Civil Surgeon on medical examination of the workman gave a certificate that as per his own statement the age of the workman is about 51 years and by appearance he is about 53 years, this certificate is dated 24-9-81. That thereafter the applicant was served with a notice dt. 31-1-84, stating that as the workman would be completing on 14-4-84 age of retirement he would be retired from the bank's service on 15-4-84, the workman objected to the retirement notice and asserted that per certificate of CMO he should be retired in September, 1988 on which the branch manager informed the workman that as per record the date of birth was 15-4-24 which was not in his knowledge, alongwith his claim statement he has filed photo copy of the management letter dt. 21-4-81 addressed to the Civil Surgeon for medical examination and report. His report is dt. nil and is annexure II of the claim statement.

3. The workman has further filed another document annexure III which is the management's letter dt. 9th September 1980, regarding date of birth of employee as contained in several circular dt. 25-5-54 wherein it is laid down thus:

In all those cases where the workman is non-matriculate and can not produce any of the proof of his date of birth the same may be admitted on the basis of declaration on the age given by employee at the time of appointment. The employee may also be required to submit a certificate of age from the Civil Surgeon in which they reside.

This relate to the procedure at the time of appointment and not at the time of age of retirement. This is possibly with the view that in case the actual date of birth is not available the date of birth of young man entering into employment can be ascertained by medical examination i.e. by ossification of bone etc. It is further mentioned at the end that the date of birth in such cases should be recorded after proper verification under signatures of the authorise person. Workman has filed annexure 6 dt. 15-3-84 in which he admitted that some branch manager had obtained his signature long ago showing my date of birth as 15-4-24 about which he raised objection when the fact came to his notice, no such objection has either been summoned or filed. The workman has filed affidavit annexure VII in which he has shown his date of birth as 24.9.22

4. The management has filed its written statement alleging that after joining the bank the workman gave declaration in his own hand writing that his date of birth is 15-4-24, and subsequently sent confirmation that his date of birth was 15-4-24. The two documents are annexures 1 and 2 alongwith the written statement of the management and it was on that account that after attaining the age of 60 years the workman was retired from the bank's service on 16-5-84 after permission from the ALC Central. It is further averred by the management that the workman Shri Dil Bahadur had a Life Insurance Policy. The management enquired from the manager Life Insurance Corporation to intimate as to what was the date of birth given by the workman to his department. The Manager of Life Insurance Deptt., vide its letter dt. 14-2-86 informed the management bank that the date of birth recorded (regarding workman in question) with them is 15-4-24. This date exactly coincides with the date of birth 1012GI/86—14

given by the workman under his signature. The letter of the LIC is annexure III alongwith the reply of the same written by the management bank to LIC photo copy filed as annexure IV. A copy of the Policy of the workman has been filed by the management as annexure V in which his age is shown to be written as 50 years in July 74 and this period also coincides with the age given by the workman. The management admits that the workman was sent for medical examination assuring that civil surgeon will give his report after X-ray of bones, chemical examination of nails and hair but he certified the age of the workman on the basis of workman's declaration and appearance as 51 and 54 years respectively. The management has also filed history sheet of the workman as annexure VII showing that the workman was appointed on 1-7-48 as guard and date of birth as 15-4-1924.

5. In support of its contention management gave affidavit evidence of Shri R. K. Sood who was the branch manager during the relevant time, in cross examination he deposes that annexures 1 and 2 of the written statement are on the personal file of the workman. He however, admitted that he has no knowledge as to when and to whom the workman gave these two documents. He further stated that original of annexures 1 and 2 was sent to him by the Regional Manager on 14-1-1982. He admits that provident fund deduction is always after confirmation and confirmation is given after six months of joining. It may be mentioned here that in the history sheet the provident fund number is written as 7366. He admits that annexure 1 of the claim statement of the workman dt. 21-9-81 addressed and requiring medical examination of the workman and he wrote this in view of para 3 of circular dt. 9-9-80 annexure 3. He admits that from the Regional Manager's Office he received letter dt. 28-7-81 on which he directed the workman to obtain the age of certificate. The management has filed copy of that letter. This shows that despite several reminders the management of Sadar Branch have not supplied the copy of self declaration of the sole employee which is stated to be sole age proof at your records. These wordings show that from declaration by the workman was there on record which was to be sent to the Regional Manager's office by way of abandoned caution. The Regional Manager's office however, suggested that the workman may be got examined by Civil Surgeon and it was on that account that he issued a letter annexure I. He however admits that the representation dt. 15-3-84 of the workman before retirement was submitted by him to the Regional Manager as it was addressed to him.

6. On the other hand workman gave his affidavit evidence reiterating his claim statement. In cross examination he deposes that he had not given his date of birth at the time of joining the bank. He however, admits that his life is insured though he does not remember the date when he obtained it. Regarding date of birth in the policy he states that his policy deposited in the bank and in that his date of birth must have been given by bank. He however, admits that the signature on annexure 1 is in his hand writing but states that he does not know what is written in that as he is illiterate and can simply sign. He also admitted his signature on annexure II but admitted that he does not know what was written there. He denies having told to the CMO that he was aged 51 years though CMO has written that age was disclosed by him and further admits that certificate by CMO was given to him, only after physical examination.

7. In a case like this it has to be found as to what was the earliest opportunity when the workman gave out his age or could have given his age. The workman admits having put his signature on annexure 1 of the written statement. From the document itself it is not clear as to on what date the same was got signed by him. It simply recites that his date of birth was 15-4-24 and that he joined the bank on 1-7-48 and was confirmed after six months i.e. on 1-2-49. There is yet another document annexure II which the workman admits of having been signed it. It recites as under:

I hereby solemnly declare that my date of birth is 15-4-24 (15th April, 1924). I have no horoscope to submit in proof of my age.

This document too does not bear any date. One gets provident fund number after confirmation, it appears that history sheet was prepared some time after confirmation of the workman in which his date of birth by him per annexure II.

8. It is argued by the representative for the workman that this history sheet was prepared some times when the question of his retirement raised and letter were written by Regional Manager on 28th July, 1981. I am not prepared to believe this contention because as early as in the year 1974, the workman got his life insured in which he submitted a proposal form and it was on the basis of proposal form that policy ext. 5 was drawn in which it is written that at the time of policy his age was 50 years. Further on the basis of enquiry the branch manager LIC intimated management bank that in the proposal submitted by the workman the date of birth of the workman was written to be 15-4-24. This information even if submitted by management it must have been done in the year 1974 i.e. long before question of his retirement raised and the basis of information possibly could have either the history sheet or two declaration sheet admittedly signed by the workman i.e. annexure II.

9. In these circumstances, I am not inclined to believe the contention of the workman that he did not give his declaration regarding date of birth in annexure 1 and 2 and the Civil Surgeon wrongly gave the age 51 as is told by the workman and age 53 without medically examined the workman i.e. ossification of bones, chemical examination of hair and nails, on the basis of appearance. In these circumstances and for the reasons discussed above, I believe the contention of the management and hold that the action of the management was justified in retiring the workman from service w.e.f. 16-5-84. The result is that the workman is not entitled to any relief.

I, accordingly give my award.

Let six copies of this award be sent to the Govt. for its publication.
Dt. 29-9-86

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/21/85-D. IV(A)]

का. अ. 3810.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, न्यू इंडिया एश्यरेंस कां. लि. कानपुर के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अन्वय में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9 अक्टूबर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3820.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur, as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of New India Assurance Company Limited, Kanpur and their workman Shri Thakur Prasad, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 2 of 1985
Reference No. L-12012/25/85-D. II A dated 23-12-85
In the matter of dispute between

WORKMEN: Shri Thakur Prasad C/o Sh. O. P. Nigam,
295/387 Deen Dayal Road, Lucknow.

INDUSTRY: Regional Manager M/s. New India Assurance Company Limited, Green House, 15/60, Civil Lines, Kanpur.

STATE: Uttar Pradesh.

APPEARANCES:

1. Shri O. P. Nigam, representative—for the Workman.
2. Shri Amreck Singh, representative—for the Management.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its notification No. L-12012/25/85-D. II-B dated 23rd December, 1985, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

Whether the action of the management of New India Assurance Company, Kanpur in terminating the services of Shri Thakur Prasad, Peon w.e.f. 20th July, 1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed by Shri R. S. Goel, Senior Inspector of the management company, Gorakhpur Branch on 1st July, 1972 as peon, who later on intimated the Divisional Office Varanasi vide letter dated 5th November, 1973 forwarding the data forms in duplicate regarding peon employed by the branch but his services were abruptly terminated on 20th July, 1975. It is however averred that alongwith him name of one Shri Naseem Alam appointed as Assistant was also forwarded whose appointment was confirmed by the Divisional Manager. The applicant was working full time as peon and was assisting the branch manager as well as doing all duties as peon required by the branch. It is further averred that the applicant was never given any appointment letter nor termination letter though he continued to work from 1st July, 1972 to 20th July, 1975, and at the time of termination he was never given notice or notice pay and through out was paid salary Rs. 75 per month when other peons of the company were paid scale wages. The workman had been pressing the authorities for his reinstatement and his regularisation but to no avail, hence he raised the industrial dispute. He has consequently prayed to be reinstated in services with full back wages.

3. The management contested the application of the workman on the ground that the dispute arose is not an industrial dispute as no relationship of employer or employee ever existed between the parties and as such the applicant was not a workman as defined under the Industrial Dispute Act and that the case is belated as reference has been made after about 10 years. The management has however contended that at best the relationship if any, existed between the applicant and Shri R. S. Goel in his personal capacity and can at best be termed as a domestic servant. The management further contended that in the year 1972, there was no branch of the company at Gorakhpur and Shri R. S. Goel was a simply Senior Inspector of the company posted at Gorakhpur and at the relevant time had employed the applicant in his personal capacity to do a little work of his own. That the question of termination of the workman does not arise as he was never appointed by the company and as such there was no question of issuing any appointment letter or termination letter. The management has further averred that the applicant was kept by Shri R. S. Goel the then Senior Inspector of the Company at Gorakhpur as his domestic servant and the applicant was not in any way connected with the company.

4. In support of his contention the workman has filed a letter Ext. W-1 dated 5th November, 1973, whereby Shri R. S. Goel, intimated the divisional office Varanasi regarding appointment of part time Assistant and peon by him intimating as under:

Enclosed please find two sets of Data Forms in duplicate in respect of Assistant and Peon employed by us.

The other set of form copies of which is D1/A shows that he was employed on a salary of Rs. 75 from 1st July, 1972. Then workman has further filed Ext. Q-2 letter written by Shri R. S. Goel to Kotwali Gorakhpur intimating that peon Shri Thakur Prasad pick-pocketed by some one depriving him of Rs. 250 when he had gone to Central Bank of India to deposit the same. The workman has further filed Ext. W-3 dated 9th September, 1974, whereby Divisional Secretary of the Management Employees Union intimated that the cycle of office peon had been stolen and that funds be made available for purchase of another one for performance of work by office peon, and lastly workman has filed letter dated 25th July, 1975 Ext. D-4 intimated from branch incharge management company Gorakhpur regarding termination of the workman's services.

5. On behalf of the management Shri R. S. Goel filed his affidavit evidence. He has averred there in that as Senior Inspector he was posted at Gorakhpur during the relevant period and at present he is Branch Manager of the Company at Gorakhpur branch. That as Senior Inspector his main working used to be that of field work and he had absolutely no power to employ or terminate even a Class IV employee. He denied that the workmen was ever employed by the company, that he came to know workmen when he was working in Rotary Club as a peon and then he requested him to look after a little bit work also in private capacity. He has specifically averred there in that the workman was never on the rolls of the company nor he ever employed by the company and that he use to pay him Rs. 75 per month in his personal capacity for the services rendered by him, that the workman was never paid any salary from the company nor he ever signed any register of the company. In cross examination he stated that Gorakhpur branch of the company was opened in the year 1973 in March or July and one peon Shiv Ram Singh was transferred there but he never joined and fresh appointments were made in the company in 1979 or 1980. At the very outset of the cross examination he stated that the Gorakhpur branch of the company was opened in the year 1975 in March or July and one peon Shiv Ram who never joined and fresh hands were appointed later on. He has specifically admitted in cross examination that the workman was appointed by him for his personal working not as his domestic servant but for working in his office from time and that he use to pay him Rs. 75 per month for work in his office. He further admitted that during 72 to 75 he maintained a office and rent register of the office premises which were paid by him though telephone charges and other office expenses were paid by the management. He has admitted that paper nos. Ext. W-1, 2 and 3 he has further admitted that he had recommended two persons for appointment.

6. On the other hand workman Shri Thakur Prasad had appeared in the witness box and deposed the case set out in his claim statement. He states that in cross examination that Shri Jai Prakash and Shiv Murat have been appointed after his termination. In the end he has denied that Shri Goel had employed him as part time private peon while he was working in the Rotary Club.

7. The workman has failed to show that prior to July, 1975, there was a branch of the company at Gorakhpur and if Shri Goel, Senior Inspector of the management at Gorakhpur had appointed him at Rs. 75 per month as salary that would not amount to appointment by the company unless the same is ratified by the company and is paid from the funds of the company. In view of the interpretation clause (2) of the Industrial Dispute Central Rules, sub clause (g) giving interpretation of the word "employer" occurring in section 2 of the I.D. Act, it is laid down thus :

that in relation to an industry the office incharge of the industrial establishment shall be the employer in respect of that establishment.

Senior inspector Shri Goel was admittedly not officer incharge of the establishment at Gorakhpur but was merely an inspector and had recommended the appointment of peon to his Divisional Office which was never approved and as such any appointment made by him will have no concern with the management company of the opposite party and thus the management company would not be the employer of the workman concerned and utmost he was employed by Shri R. S. Goel in his personal capacity on a monthly remuneration of Rs. 75 per month.

8. Thus there existed no relationship of employer and employee between the workman and management company and the applicant would not be a workman within the definition of the Industrial Dispute Act being not employed in an industry.

9. Regarding question of belated it may be mentioned that there is no limitation given in the Industrial Dispute Act. Further if the Central Government, in its wisdom refers a belated dispute for adjudication that cannot be thrown out on that account and the reference has to be answered either in negative or affirmative.

10. Thus, in these circumstances, and facts discussed above, I hold that the management M/s. New India Assurance Com-

pany Limited, Kanpur, never terminated the services of the workman Shri Thakur Prasad w.e.f. 20th July, 1975, and the workman is not entitled to any relief as claimed for.

11. I, therefore, give my award accordingly.

12. Let 6 copies of this Award be sent to the Government for its publication.

Dated : 6th October, 1986.

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-17012/25/85-D. IV(A)]

K. J. DYVA PRASAD, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 27 अक्टूबर, 1986

का.आ. 3821.—उत्प्रवास अधिनियम, 1983 (1983 का 31) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय वृत्तवाय, बोहा (कतार) के राजदूत श्री एम. एल. मलिक को यमन प्राधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने तथा उन नियोजकों, जो उस देश में रोजगार के लिए किसी भारतीय नागरिक की भरती के प्रयोजनार्थ भारतीय नागरिक नहीं है, को परमिट जारी करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फ. सं.-22020/1/86-उत्प्रवास-II]

ए. के. टंडन, उत्प्रवास महासंरक्षक तथा संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th October, 1986

S.O. 3821.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 15 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (31 of 1983), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri S. L. Malik, Ambassador of Embassy of India, Doha (Qatar) to exercise the powers of Competent Authority and to issue permits to the employers who are not citizens of India for the purpose of recruiting any citizen of India for Employment in that country.

[File No. A-22020/1/86-Emig. II]

A. K. TANDON, Protector General of Emigrants & Jt. Secy.

का. भा. 3822.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, लोह अयस्क खान, मैंगनीज अयस्क खान और क्रोम अयस्क खान श्रम कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 61) के धारा 2 के खंड (ख) के उपखंड (ii) के अनुसूची में भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 7 नवंबर, 1985 में प्रकाशित इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. भा. 5296 के क्रम में नीचे दी गई अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए धातुकर्म कारखाने घोषित करती है, अर्थात् :

अनुसूची

1. मैसर्स केप्ट स्टील लिमिटेड, बंगलौर
2. मैसर्स सरोज झालाय एंड स्टील लिमिटेड, कर्नाटक
3. मैसर्स कनारा स्टील लिमिटेड, बंगलौर
4. मैसर्स आंध्र स्टील लिमिटेड, बंगलौर
5. मैसर्स कर्नाटक सीमेंट लिमिटेड, गुलबर्गा
6. मैसर्स कोरोमंडल फटिलाइजर लिमिटेड, चिलसकूर
7. मैसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट कंपनी लिमिटेड, विजयवाड़ा

[सं. एम.-23021/2/80-एम-4/कल्याण-2]

एस. एम. भल्ला, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3822.—In pursuance of sub-clause (ii) of clause (g) of section 2 of the Iron Ore Mines, Manganese Ore Mines and Chrome Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1976 (61 of 1976) and in continuation of this Ministry's notification No. S.O. 5296 published in Part-II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 7th November, 1985, the Central Government hereby declares the

factories specified in the schedule below to be metallurgical factories for the purposes of the said Act, namely :—

SCHEDULE

1. M/s. Caps Steel Limited, Bangalore.
2. M/s. Saroj Alloy and Steel Limited, Karnataka.
3. M/s. Canara Steel Limited, Bangalore.
4. M/s. Andhra Steel Limited, Bangalore.
5. M/s. Karnataka Cement Limited, Gulbarga.
6. M/s. Coromandal Fertilizers Limited, Chilamkur.
7. M/s. Andhra Cement Company Limited, Vijayawada.

[F. No. S-23012/2/80-MIV/W-II]
S. S. BHALLA, Under Secy.

का. घा. 3823.—मैसर्स जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन लि., ई., बी., के. सामपाथ नगर पेण्डुरी रोड, इरोड-638011, और इसकी शाखाएं जो कोड नं. टी.एन/17219 के अधीन हैं। (जिसे इसमें, इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 का 17 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिये जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी किसी पृथक् अभिदाय या प्रोविडेंट फंड का संशय किये बिना हों, जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम अर्थात् बीमा के रूप में फायदे उठा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए वे फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारी निवेश संचयन स्कीम, 1978 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुभूत हैं।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा-2क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इसके उपाय अनुपूर्वी में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम में सभी उपबंधों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त (मलनाडु) को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएँ प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय-समय पर निश्चित करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रमारों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर संदाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा-17 की उपधारा 3-क के खंड-क के अधीन समय-समय पर निश्चित करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिनके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का संदाय, लेखाओं का भ्रंश, निरीक्षण प्रमारों का संदाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा अनुमोदित जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाये, तब उस संशोधन को प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उनकी मुख्य भाषाओं का अनुवाद स्थापन के सूचना पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन के भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है, तो नियोजक जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के सदस्य के

रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम ट्रस्टीज ऑफ प्रोविडेंट फंड ट्रस्ट को संवत् करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाये जाते हैं तो, नियोजक जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि किये जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुभूत हैं।

7. जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इन स्कीम के अधीन संवेय रकम उस रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संवेय होती जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिवक वारिस/नाम निर्देशितों की प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के उपबंधों में कोई भी संशोधन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त तमिलनाडु के पूर्ण अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो, वहां प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्ण कर्मचारियों को अपना वृद्धिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश स्थापन के कर्मचारी ट्रस्टीज ऑफ प्रोविडेंट फंड ट्रस्ट की इस जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन एम्प्लॉयज फैमिली बनेफिट स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाता है या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर जो नियोजक (जीवा ट्रांसपोर्ट कार्पोरेशन) नियत करे, प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है और पालिसी को व्यपगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय में किये गये किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नाम निर्देशितियों या विधिवक वारिसों को जो यदि यह छूट न दी गई होती तो, उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते। बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक इस स्कीम अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकदार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिवक वारिसों को बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय तत्पश्चात् से और प्रत्येक दशा में ट्रस्टीज ऑफ प्रोविडेंट फंड ट्रस्ट से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के एक मास के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[एच-35014(244) 86-एसएस2]

ए. के. भट्टारार्थ, धवर सचिव

S.O. 3823.—Whereas Messrs Jeeva Transport Corporation Limited, E.V.K. Sampath Nagar, Perundurai Road, Erode-638011 and its branches covered under code No. (TN) 17219) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds & Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees' Deposit Linked

Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner Tamil Nadu and maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Trustees of P. F. Trust.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this Scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme, shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Tamil Nadu, and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Jeeva Transport Corporation's Employees' Family Benefits Scheme as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date as fixed by the employer (Jeeva Transport Corporation) and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said

Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the members covered under the Scheme the employer (Jeeva Transport Corporation) shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs of the deceased member entitled for it and in any case within one month from the receipt of claim complete in all respects.

[No. S-35014(244)-86-SSII]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 अक्टूबर, 1986

का. अ. 3824.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसार में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री. सिंगरेनी कार्लोस कं. लिमिटेड, बेल्लम्पल्ली, अदिलबाद जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश), के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पक्षों को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 29th October, 1986

S.O. 3824.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli, Adilabad Distt. (A.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 32 of 1985

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Bellampalli, Adilabad District.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Bellampalli, Adilabad District.

APPEARANCES :

Sri Naushad Ali, Advocate—for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal, and Miss
G. Sudha, Advocates—for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-21012(2)/85-D.III (B) dated 21-5-1985 referred the following dispute under Sections 10(1)(d) and Sub-section (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the Management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli in not giving a chance to Sri Harry Christy, Mechanic Category VI in appearing for a trade test for promotion to the post of charge Hand and thereby depriving him from promotion is justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 32 of 1985 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the Workmen of Singareni Collieries Automobile Workers Association, Mandamari questioning the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli in not giving chance to Sri Harry Christy, Mechanic Category VI in appearing for trade test for promotion to post of Charge Hand and questioning the same as not justified. In the claims

statement it is mentioned that Harry Christy was appointed as Mechanic in Category VII in Singareni Collieries in the year 1966 and revision of jobs basing on the recommendations of Wage Board I, he was categorised in Category V in the year 1978 he was promoted to Category VI. According to him he passed F.U.C. and he holds I.T.I. Certificate and diploma in B.I.E.T. from British Institute of Engineering and Technology, Bombay. Thus it is his case that he is qualified for promotion to the Grade of Charge Hand from Category VI. According to him when the promotion was due in the year 1983 the Workman was denied the same while two others namely Janardhan working in B.P.A. Division and Devarajam working in the R.K.R. Division who were not qualified were accorded promotion. It is his case that his efforts to have grievance settled through conciliation failed, hence the dispute. According to the Management is under obligation to called for test at 1 : 3 ratio and when there are two vacancies in the present case, six persons ought to have been considered whereas only four persons were considered, thus depriving him of opportunity of promotion. He also alleged that the Management resorted to this step in order to victimise the petitioner as he is the Area Secretary of the S.C. Automobile Association. Therefore he wanted this Tribunal to declare the action of the Management in depriving the promotion of the petitioner from Category VI to Charge hand with effect from 1983 is illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory.

3. In the counter filed by the Management, it is admitted that he was promoted to Category VI from 1-1-1978. It is mentioned that as per the Company Rules, Mechanic should have put in five years of service in Category VI are eligible for promotion to the post of Chandhand irrespective of their qualifications subject to availability of vacancies in order of seniority and merits. According to the Management in the year 1983, Mechanics, in order of seniority were called to appear for a written test/practical test and interview and the vacancies available at that time were filled with the candidates who came out successfully in the test/interview as per Circular dated 26/27-11-1982. It is denied that Devarajam and Janardhan were not qualified to appear for the test and it is also pointed out that the Petitioner did not raise any objection when the test/interview was conducted to that effect. Finally it is mentioned that the Petitioner is junior to Janardhan and Devarajam. It is also stated that four vacancies of Grade C Chargehand were identified in the year 1983 and there were four vacancies and to fill up these vacancies three workers namely Malleish, Rabober and Anjiah were drafted in the year 1981 itself as per the Agreement entered in to between the Management and the Union dated 21-1-1981 as per the agreement all the above mentioned three candidates were to be placed in Grade C as Chargehand on the basis of Assessment Report, test and interview against three vacancies and thus there was one vacancy left for open competition. For the written and interview three candidates Md. Ismail, Devarajam and Janardhan Motor Mechanic Workshops from Bellampalli, Ramakrishnapur and Bellampalli respectively were called for against one vacancy in the proportionate of 1 : 3 ratio. They found that one Motor Mechanic failed to secure the minimum mark in Assessment Report and as such his case was not considered and the Committee recommended two candidates out of the three and while adjusting vacancies due to failure of one Grade C motor mechanic it was filled by Category VI in Motor Mechanic. So it is incorrect that there are two vacancies as alleged by the workman and it is also incorrect to say that six candidates ought to have been called for interview. It is also denied that the Management followed any discriminatory or arbitrary procedure. Therefore the petitioner is put to strike proof of the allegation made in the petitioner and the Management prayed that the petition should be dismissed.

4. For the Workmen WW-1 examined himself and the Management side no witnesses were examined. For the Workmen Ex. W-1 to W-4 were marked and for the Management Ex. M-1 to M-4 were marked.

5. WW-1 is a workman Sri Harry Christy. According to him he was promoted to Category VI as Mechanic from 1-1-1978 and the Management filed a list. With regard to Devarajam and Janardhan it is his case that Janardhan was in Category IV in 1967 which is a junior skill as per the Wage Board while he was in the Category V in 1967 and

thus he was senior to him. Similarly it is his case that Devarajam was promoted in VI Category in 1978 and he was having no educational qualification or technical qualifications whereas the required qualification is matriculation with I.T.I. with a minimum service of 10 years in Category VI. He filed Ex. W-1 Circular to show the same. According to him Ex. M-2 minutes of discussions held between the Management and the Union on 24-4-1976 the Tradesmen in Category VI who have prescribed qualifications and who have put in not less than 10 years service are eligible for promotion to charge hand Grade C subject to passing the Trade test and availability of the vacancies but these two persons Devarajam and Janardhan as per Ex. M-1 have not ten years experience as mentioned in para 6 for Category VI. It is his case that when they were two vacancies to be filled in by promotion to charge hand, three persons were called for interview and he was not called for interview. He asserted that normally the ratio must be at 1 : 3 for each vacancy and for two vacancies six people should have been called for interview. The representation made by him is Ex. W-2 and he gave copy of it to the Executive Engineer also and suit no action was taken. He marked the conciliation proceeding to show that he followed the procedure required as Ex. W-3. According to him he also had more qualification than Janardhan and that Devarajam had no qualification at all for being promoted. It is his case that he is the Secretary of the S.C. Automobile Workers Association since 1983 and he marked Ex. W-4 to show that he was Secretary even as per the Management Circular for Automobile Workers Association. According to him the Management wanted to suppress him as he is an active member of the Association without giving him chargehand post with effect from 1983. According to WW-1 in case seniority is maintained in Category VI after passing of the Trade test and Janardhan passed trade test before him. He agreed that for filing up the chargehand post a trade test is conducted and basing upon the successful eligible candidates will be called for. He mentioned that as per Ex. W-1 one should be a matriculate passed, 10 years experience in Category VI. He denied the suggestion that the said 10 years experience was reduced from eight years and than further reduced to five years as on 1983. He denied that the Management had given any circular as per proforma shown to him as per Ex. M-3 seeking the particulars of all the workmen to fix their higher category. He denied the suggestion that he had knowledge of the said Circular under Ex. M-3. He did not make any representations but only after trade test is over in order to create a dispute regarding his seniority. He raised this matter. He admitted that there was a settlement on 29-1-1981 as per Ex. M-4. He agreed that Malleish, Robert and Anjiah were drafted as Grade C as per Ex. M-4 Settlement. According to him they were already in Grade C Mechanic and they were already office orders given to them to absorb them whenever vacancies were there. He denied that there are only four vacancies at the time. According to him even after these people were absorbed it is not correct that there was one vacancy to be considered for promotion. According to him there were five vacancies in all and after giving promotions to these persons, still, two vacancies existed. He conceded that he did not file any documents to prove the same. He mentioned that he came to know Md. Ismail failed when he appeared for Trade test along with Janardhan after the result was published. He denied that there is only one vacancy to be filled and three people who were seniors to him were called for interview. According to him he became union Secretary of S.C. Automobile Workers Association in February 1983 and the test is conducted on 10-6-1983. According to him even earlier to Ex. W-4 he served the Management with copies of office beaters of their Union and there was no representation about his victimisation. He denied that he had no requisite qualifications and seniority He calling him for trade test as 1 : 3 ratio basis and as such he was not eligible for promotion.

6. It is worth noting that the Management reported that they have no oral evidence to be adduced and marked Exs. M-1 to M-4 only, on their part. On the other hand the workmen evidence would show that Harry Christy was working as Category VI from 1-1-1978 as Motor Mechanic and that the hand I.T.I. Certificate and Diploma in B.I.E.T. from British Institute of Engineering and Technology, Bombay. As per Ex. W1 for being promoted as Chargehand Mechanic, the Singareni Colliery Circular prescribed that

one should be a matriculate or equivalent qualification and should hold I.T.I. Certificate of Fitter or any other equivalent recognised certificate from the Central or State Government and performance will be given to persons possessing diploma in Mechanic Engineering and he should have at least 10 years experience of Fitter of any Industry or Mechanised Mine. As per Ex. M-1 which is the statement filed by the Management, it is clear that he was in Category VI from 1-1-1978 and his educational qualification were B.Sc. first year failed and I.T.I. 'C' Certificate Holder. Now when Ex. W1 prescribed minimum qualification of I.T.I. technical qualification with minimum 10 years experience in Category VI when Categories are revised from time to time and when Harry Christy was originally appointed on 8-12-1966 and fixed by the Wage Board on 15-8-1967 in the newly prescribed Category V and promoted to VI Category on 1-1-1978. His case is that he had all the eligible qualifications for promotion to Charge Hand C and two persons namely Devarajam and Janardhan shown in Ex. M1 were definitely not qualified as they did not have 10 years experience as mentioned in Ex. W-1 for promotion as Chargehand C. It is his case that they were called for interview and they were appointed. Now it is also his case that it is clear from Ex. M2 minutes of discussions that the Tradesmen in Category VI who have prescribed qualifications and have put in not less than 10 years of service are eligible for promotion to Chargehand Grade C subject to passing of Trade Test and availability of vacancies.

7. Now in the instant case promotions were to be effective as Charge hand from 1-3-1983. In 1978 when he was promoted to Category VI there was nothing like prescribed conditions that one should have 10 years experience. If that Circular Ex. M2 which is dated 24-4-1976 minutes of discussions Class 6 is directly implemented for the promotion which was due on 1-3-1983 none of the persons will be there with 10 years experience. Even as per Ex. M-1 Devarajam is only 6th Standard passed and he had no qualifications of I.T.I. or Matriculation pass and 10 years experience. Even Janardhan is H.S.C. and I.T.I. pass but he had no experience of 10 years. Now as against Devarajam he had no educational qualification or Technical qualifications or experience as per Ex. M1 chart which is filed by the management definitely Harry Christy stands a better chance. Further the evidence of WW-1 would show that normally for any post they used to call 1:3 ratio for each vacancy and there are two vacancies to be filled by promotion in Chargehand Section and Management called only three persons. The Management case is that there is only one vacancy and therefore three persons are called. But first of all whether there are two vacancies or one vacancy is the matter in dispute. The Management did not file any date to show that there is only one vacancy. According to the Management this person Harry Christy did not pass trade test and that he passed trade test subsequently to Janardhan and therefore he is not considered for the available vacancy of chargehand. But it is the case of the Management that Trade test is to be conducted and out of successful candidates seniority cum merit and whoever is eligible will be selected. Of course it is suggested to Harry Christy by the Management that the experience originally fixed as 10 years under Ex. M2 was reduced to 8 years and then to file year as on 1983 and Harry Christy did not agree for it. In this connection the Management relied upon Ex. M3. It shows that for implementing Item 2 of Memorandum of Settlement dated 20th August 1982 information in respect of Foreman and Chargehand Grade C and Grade B and all the Tradesman tradewise and in order of seniority who are on rolls as on 30-11-1982 was asked to be furnished in a proforma. In his case of Harry Christy it was not furnished. Harry Christy answered stating that perhaps this Circular was not sent to the Head of Department but he was not aware of the same and he came to know only after the trade test was over and it is his case that he questioned orally why he was not given such circular and none of the officers gave him correct reply. It is suggested though he had knowledge of the Circular Ex. M3 kept quite and only after trade test is over he created a dispute that he raised the issue of seniority. The suggestion itself falls to the ground from the very nature of suggestion. First of all it is pointed out that it is the duty of the Management to serve Circular Ex. M3 on all the persons for collecting information for filling posts in respect

of Foreman and Chargehands etc. as per the order of seniority and Trade test passed if any. How can a person who is working can be asked to fill the proforma without being given? There is no evidence such Circular Ex. M3 was given to Harry Christy. No management witness came forward to depose to that effect. There is no evidence that it was placed in the notice board or that so and who is the Head of the Department where Harry Christy was working had occasion to circulate it to him. Even Ex. M3 is a circular given. It is the mistake of the Management for not arriving correct seniority basing upon all factual date regarding the tradesmen for respect promotions. Now in this context that he being a Secretary of the Trade Union as indicated under Ex. W4 was victimised has some relevance. The Circular Ex. W4 would show that the Singareni Collieries Automobile Workers Association intimidated the Management the Chief Executive Director and the Executive Director, Bellampally Area that admittedly the workers of Bellampally, Ramakrishnapur and Mandamari Division have elected Harry Christy as Secretary of the Association. When five years experience is sufficient as per the Management counsel's suggestion, as per the question to Harry Christy in the cross examination and when there is clear admission that two persons were promoted one by name Janardhan and the other Devarajam and when there is ratio of 1:3 for calling for interview and to assert that there is only one vacancy and that Md. Ismail of Bellampally Division was called for interview along with Janardhan is not correct. As per the provisions of Settlement dated 9-1-1981 under Ex. M4 Mallesh, Robert Anjiah were drafted to Charge Hand C and thus there is only one vacancy is not established Harry Christy had no objection for implementation of Settlement under Ex. M-14 whereunder B. Mallesh Robert and Anjiah were agreed to be given Chargehand C. He explained that they were originally 'C' Grade Mechanic and they were office orders that they should be observed as Charge Hand Grade C whenever the vacancies arise and thus he had no grievance. But he denied that they were only four vacancies at that time after these three persons were absorbed and only one vacancy was to be considered for promotion. He asserted that there are five vacancies after giving promotion to these three persons still there will be two vacancies. Of course he did not file any documents to substantiate the same. The Management too did not file any documents to substantiate that there is only one vacancy. Further Md. Ismail of Bellampally Division was called for interview and he failed and this was known after the result was published. No it is specifically alleged by him that because he became the Secretary of the Trade Union from 1983 onwards as intimated in their circular under Ex. W4 the Management adopted an unfair labour practice. Of course he admitted that he did not represent to that effect in Ex. W2 that it is unfair labour practice. In Ex. W2 he mentioned that inspite of his seniority Janardhan was interviewed for Chargehand promotional test by neglecting him and another Devarajam and Md. Ismail were interviewed for Chargehand promotional test and that on merit basis he stood first to be interviewed for Trade test as he had all the requisite qualifications and experience. Though he did not say it is unfair labour practice it means that he was shown discrimination while his juniors were called for trade test. What else is required from a workman when he is eligible, he cannot directly state in a explanation statement mentioned that there is unfair labour practice and purchase trouble from the Management. Nobody would like to say that the Management is biased. He still hoped by representing under Ex. W2 by pointing out that his junior were interviewed that the Management will open their eyes and consider his merits interse. But it cannot be said that no unfair labour practice was alleged and therefore that his subsequent oral evidence on this aspect is groundless. First of all the Management did not prove that there were no two vacancies for promotional candidates and that there is only one vacancy. When there are two vacancies six persons should have been called for interview as per the normal practice. They tried to eliminate Harry Christy that way and then could not explain how his averment in Ex. W2 that Janardhan Devarajam and Ismail who were not having requisite qualifications were interviewed for trade test is justified. Either way the Management failed. In that context his allegation that he was the Secretary of the S. C. Automobile Workers Association and that he was discrimi-

nated by not calling for interview has a bearing and it has to be looked from that angle that he was purposefully eliminated being the Trade Union activist.

8. So on a careful consideration I hold that the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampally in not giving a chance to Sri Harry Christy, Mechanic Category VI for appearing for trade test for promotion to the post of Chargehand is not justified. It is clear case of depriving him of promotion and therefore the action is unjustified. Now regarding the relief since he had requisite qualifications and also experience and education and service as per circulars of the Management from time to time he is entitled to be promoted as Chargehand Grade C from 1-3-1983 with all attendant benefits treating that the trade test is only a formality and he was purposefully eliminated without being served with E. M3 Circular and without being called for interview while calling his juniors who were not qualified when it is held that it is unfair labour practice and that the action of the Management is unjustified and it amounted to deprivation of promotion it automatically goes to show that he should have been promoted had he been called for trade test. In the said circumstances he is entitled to be promoted to Chargehand Grade 'C' from 1-3-1983.

9. The award is passed accordingly and the Management was given three adjournments for arguing the matter after they followed the arguments of the workmen on 22-8-1986 and having took time for arguing the matter to 23-8-86, 26-8-1986. On 26-8-1986 the counsel was permitted to argue the matter on or before 3-8-1986. Thus their arguments were finally treated as closed on 30-8-1986 as indicated in the docket sheet. The Management could have filed the written arguments if they had any and in the light of cross examination done to WW-1, the managements arguments in the light of their counter and cross examination and Exs. M-1 to M4, it is made clear that they are basing only on documentary evidence. Thus I am satisfied that no further time is required for any oral arguments and the time given for written argument during four adjournments is sufficient. The Management had relied upon only documents from Exs. M1 to M4. After going through these documents properly and also the arguments of the Workmen I had no hesitation to pass an award on merits in the given circumstances.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal this the 22nd day of September, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL.

Appendix of Evidence.

Witnesses Examined
for the Workman:

Witnesses Examined
for the Management:

W. W1 Harry Christy.

NII

Documents marked for the Workmen :

- Ex. W1 True copy of the Circular No. P4/2940/1143, dated 10-6-70 issued to all Pits & Department of all Collieries by the General Manager, S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem Collieries.
- Ex. W2 Photostat copy of the representation dated 6-8-83 made by Harry Christy to the Additional Mining Engineer, Mandamarri Division with regard to promotion to chargehand.
- Ex. W3 True copy of the Minutes of meeting held on 21-1-85 at Maocheriah as in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of S. C. Co. Ltd., and their workman represented by S.C.A.W. Association regarding promotion of Harry Christy, Mechanic Cat. VI to charge hand with retrospective date.
- Ex. W4 Photostat copy of the Circular dated 13-7-83 issued by L. Mallalah, General Secretary, Singareni Collieries Automobile Workers Association to the Chief Executive Director, S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem and the Executive Director, Bellampalli Area With regard to Automobile workshop of area Committee.

Documents marked for the Management :

- Ex. M1 True copy of the Seniority Statement showing the Service particulars of Motor Mechanics as on 11-5-85.
- Ex. M-2 Photostat copy of the Minute of discussions held between the Management of Singareni collieries Company limited and their unions, viz., Singareni Collieries Workers Union and Tendur Coal Mines Labour Union for press release.
- Ex. M3 True Copy of the Circular No. Reference No. P.B. PA/180/3415 26/27-11-82 issued by the E. D. BPA to all Mines workshops Power Houses, CSPS and Building Department of BPA Area with regard to provision of supervisory staff under memo of statement dated 20-8-82.
- Ex. M4 Photostat copy of the Memorandum of settlement arrived at under Section 12(3) of the I. D. Act, 1947 between the Management of S. C. Co. Ltd., and their workmen represented by (1) Singareni Collieries Workmen (Union 2) Tendur Coal Mines Labour Union 3) Singareni Collieries Employees Union and 4) A. P. Colliery Mazdoor Sangh on 29-1-81 at Hyderabad.

Dated 1-10-86

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Industrial Tribunal

[No. L-21012/2/85-D.III (B)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk officer